THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. Emil Brunner has emphasized in a recent work—*Justice and the Social Order* (reviewed under literature)—the distinction between love and justice, at the same time bringing out the difference between Christian Ethics and Christian Sociology. It is his contention that if we are to get a clear conception of the nature of justice, we must view it as differentiated from and contrasted with love. Just as there is a difference and contrast between the Christian man as subject to the heavenly law of forgiving love and the same Christian man as subject also to the earthly law of even-handed justice.

No doubt there is an ultimate affinity here as well as a difference and contrast. There is a close, inward relation between love and justice, as between Christian Ethics and Christian Sociology. This must not be ignored. But it is best appreciated in the light of the aforesaid difference and contrast.

There is a decided contrast between the *justitia evangelica* and the *justitia civilis*. It comes out very clearly in St. Paul. In his teaching justice or righteousness is an activity of God which is directly opposed to merits and claims, and thus to the natural sense of justice. It is not the justice which renders to each man his due, whether it be a reward for labour or a punishment for transgression. It is the love of God, merciful and forgiving, revealed in Jesus Christ, which a man does not earn but only receives.

This reversal of the ordinary notion of justice is not confined to St. Paul. We get it in the parable of the labourers in the vineyard, in which those who came first and those who came last to the labour receive the same wages. 'Once more it is love, the incomprehensible gift, bound to no law of recompensing justice and standing in absolute contrast to what we must call just in the things of this world, which is shown here as God's manner of action. It is obvious that the parable is not meant to lay down rules for the payment of wages to labourers. The point at issue here has nothing to do with mundane arrangements and their justice. What stands revealed here is the order of the Kingdom of God.'

The same point is again made clear in the 'exceeding righteousness' of the disciples by which they are to be distinguished from the Pharisees; their conduct is not to be guided by the rule of justice but by the example of the loving God, whose love is irrespective of merit or demerit. And Dr. Brunner cites other passages of the Gospels, such as Jesus' reference to the payment of tribute and His reply to Pilate's question as to whether He was a King. Here too the difference is stressed between the earthly justice in which there are just claims and obligations, credits and debits, and the heavenly justice which stands to it in direct, if dialectical, antithesis.

It is not implied, however, that the Christian community can remain indifferent to earthly justice. If Jesus Himself, the incarnate Love and Righteousness, taught practically nothing about the justice of this world, the Apostles had much instruction to give. They had to instruct the new communities how, having their citizenship in another world, they were to comport themselves regarding earthly institutions — marriage, the family, the master-servant relationship, the State.

But it is to be observed that the Apostles' teaching on such matters is homely and prosaic in tone as compared with their essential message of God's love and grace. It consists of *Haustafeln*, household words. It has been suggested that it comes from Rabbinical and Stoic ethical sources. That may quite well be. But the truth to mark is that the questions of which it treats can only be treated in homely, prosaic fashion. They have to do with the ethics of mundane systems and not with the gospel of the Kingdom of God.

It is significant that the injunctions given in these household words vary according to social and civil status. For justice discriminates, but love is the same for all. For love there is neither man nor woman, parent nor child, master nor servant, ruler nor subject. For the justice of this world it is otherwise. And as Christians have to live in a

worldly order they must conform to the principle of secular justice, rendering to each his due.

There is no false dualism here rending heavenly and earthly asunder. The order of love and the order of justice are ultimately one. It is one and the same God who gives us the law of love for our relations with our fellowmen and the law of justice for the framework of our earthly institutions and systems. It is one and the same God who commands the Roman Christians on the one hand to obey the State and honour the Law, and on the other to requite evil with good, which no law can require.

Not only so, the ultimate purpose of earthly institutions and systems is the purpose of community, or the fellowship of love. Being of the order of justice, they cannot be of the order of love; but they serve that order. Even the 'sword,' the coercive law of the State, serves it. Not that justice, as compared with love, is an inferior thing. As long as we human beings live in a world of systems, we cannot dispense with justice. Justice is always the pre-condition of love. It must be done before the real work of love begins.

For the rest, 'the demand of justice can be satisfied, the demand of love never. Its measure will never be full, while the measure of justice, as a measure of the world of systems, of the mundane sphere, is full. Love can fulfil justice, but cannot itself be fulfilled. It is always at the beginning. Only the love which is without measure fulfils itself—the love of God.'

Professor H. H. ROWLEY, Bangor, has published four lectures delivered in 1944 at a Summer School in Cambridge held under the auspices of the Baptist Missionary Society with the title, *The Missionary Message of the Old Testament*.[1] While in part they cover the same ground as his 'Israel's Mission to the World' (1939), in some important respects they supplement that earlier book. In particular, they carry the beginnings of the missionary message of the Old Testament back to Moses, and with it the idea of the election of Israel. This is the point to which we invite our readers' attention.

Moses, says Professor ROWLEY, is the real founder of Old Testament religion, and for any study of Old Testament thought it is well to begin with Moses. It is true that, whereas in one Biblical tradition God was not known to the Israelites as Jehovah until the time of Moses, in another He was known as Jehovah in the time of Abraham, and indeed in immemorial times. Thus, while the one tradition represents the divine election of Israel as announced to Moses in the wilderness, the other represents it as having been made known to Abraham. The contradiction is resolved when we realize that the Israelite tribes came in separate waves into Palestine, and not all together.

The first invasion took place between 1400 B.C. and 1350 B.C. when Judah and other southern tribes entered Palestine from the south, while other kindred tribes entered from the north. But the Central Highlands were not occupied by Israel until many years later. For it was not until between 1250 B.C. and 1200 B.C. that Moses led out of Egypt the group that subsequently crossed the Jordan and settled in this area. This means that not all the tribes were ever in Egypt, and it is only the fusing of their traditions that gives the impression that they were. It will be noticed that on this view, which Professor ROWLEY advocates, the length of the sojourn in Egypt of the tribes that went there was not four hundred and thirty years (cf. Ex 12^{40}) but rather about a century and a half.

The clue to the two traditions mentioned at the outset rests also upon another consideration. Not only did the Israelite tribes come in separate waves into Palestine, but the worship of Jehovah was introduced to the two groups of Israelite tribes in different fashion. Jehovah, as is now a common view among scholars, was worshipped by the Kenites before He was worshipped by the Israelites; and there were Kenites with the group that entered Palestine from the south with Judah; and it may be reasonably conjectured that the Kenite religion spread by gradual penetration through the whole of that group. These Israelite tribes would therefore have no memory of a dramatic moment when their worship of Jehovah began. But the other group that came out of Egypt in a later time did not forget that under Moses they had been granted a great deliverance and had thereafter pledged themselves to Jehovah in the wilderness.

Professor ROWLEY is inclined to the opinion that Moses had some Kenite blood in him, and that his mother had probably a Kenite name. 'When Levites and Kenites pressed into Canaan together, there may well have been some inter-

[1] Carey Press; 5s. net.

marriage that brought Kenite names into Levite families, and when some of those Levites then went down into Egypt to join Joseph, who had gone thither before them, such names would be found in Egypt. If this is correct, it would explain why Moses fled to a Kenite when he had to leave Egypt. For Jethro may well have been a relation on his mother's side.'

In the light of the position thus outlined, which —as it must be allowed—cannot be said to be more than probable, we can appreciate the greatness of Moses as having laid the foundations of all Israelite religion. In his call in the wilderness there came to him the astonishing message that the Kenite God, Jehovah, was sending him in His name to lead his suffering kindred out of their bondage. 'In that act the character of Jehovah stood revealed, and the seeds of the ethical religion which reached its flower in the great eighth- and seventh-century prophets appear.'

Moses was the first missionary of whom we have any knowledge. His people had hitherto worshipped El Shaddai, and did not know Jehovah as their God. But Moses claimed them for Jehovah, lifting them from a lower to a higher level of religion. It was the reversal of such a process when the children of Israel reached Canaan and exchanged Baal for Jehovah.

It should be remarked that Moses did more than get the Israelite tribes to adopt the Kenite religion. Through his own prophetic personality he gave a higher quality to the Jehovah worship than it had among the Kenites. On the great day of deliverance the winds and waves had responded not merely to the need of Israel but to the word of Moses, which he spoke in the name of his God. And when they came to the sacred mountain Israel covenanted with the God of Moses in gratitude for their wondrous deliverance. It was their response to One who had first chosen them, and that was something the Kenites had never known, something higher and more ethical than anything they had ever conceived.

It is often said that the Decalogue of Ex 20 is later than the time of Moses and reflects the teaching of the eighth-century prophets. But Professor ROWLEY demurs to this. In the so-called Decalogue of Ex 34 he sees the primitive Decalogue of the Kenites as adapted to suit a settled community—a Decalogue concerned with ritual, rather than with ethical, duties. And in the Decalogue of Ex 20 he sees the higher Decalogue of the prophetic religion established by Moses himself.

Most modern scholars, however, deny that Moses reached a full monotheistic belief. Undoubtedly in his work there was an incipient monotheism. For whether Moses regarded other gods as real or not, he certainly regarded them as negligible and unworthy of worship. Jehovah does as He pleases even in the land of Egypt. Elijah revived the Mosaic faith in the might of Jehovah after the period of Canaanite Baalism, and with Amos in the eighth century and his successors Jehovah becomes at length a truly monotheistic deity, Creator of the universe, King of all the earth, beside whom there is literally no other god.

The publishers of 'The Christian Looks Ahead' series were fortunate to secure for their book, *Making Peace*,[1] Captain Quintin HOGG, M.P., one of the ablest of the younger Conservative members. We are not concerned here with his discussion of political and economic questions, of nationalism and internationalism, of imperialism, of how disputes may be settled, of what to do with Germany. These points are handled with extraordinary freshness and ability. But what we are now concerned with is the content of chapter two which is headed 'Christianity and the Times,' and in which Captain HOGG puts and answers two questions: Why am I a Christian? and What difference does it make to my views on politics, national and international?

These are interesting questions for an alert young politician to put to himself, and we are glad to overhear what he has to say about them. He begins to answer the first question by relating an experience. He was answering a philosophical question in an examination. He hardly knew what he was going to write, but in effect he set down a reasoned defence of religious belief based on his own particular theory of cognition. He considers now that he was mistaken, because if religious belief were something the truth of which could be demonstrated to conviction, there would be little left for the ordinary man to do except to sign on the dotted line.

But religious people have never really maintained that this was the nature of their faith. That it is reasonable they assert because it is in conformity with reason, and because of all the theories of the universe they think it explains

[1] S.C.M.; 2s. 6d. net.

the largest number of known facts. But the grounds of religious belief fall short of actual demonstration, and it is in the nature of things that this should be so. Faith is partly an act of the mind, partly a function of the will. That is one conviction which the writer reached on reflection upon his examination paper. A second conviction came to him, however—that the religious theory of the world was the easiest and most plausible of the very few plausible theories which it is open to the intelligent man to accept.

It is certainly more plausible than the mechanistic theory. To-day materialism claims the allegiance of few philosophers. It is accepted by some biologists and biochemists, largely because their science is too young as yet to be brought face to face with its own metaphysical assumptions. But materialism can never explain man's cognition, or our convictions of right and wrong, good and evil, justice and injustice. The materialist holds down great regions of intellectual country by the mere force of denial, a dogmatic act of disbelief. The facts are driven below ground, like the inhabitants of Warsaw, but they exist just the same and constantly come out when the materialist is not looking.

A second theory open to an intelligent man is the objective idealism of the East, by far the most profound effort of the human intelligence to explain unaided the nature of the universe. Only during the last century or two has it proved again attractive to the unreflective mind of the West. But while it may be incredible, it has at least the merit of being neither ridiculous nor demonstrably false. 'Personally,' says Captain Hogg, 'I think it is partly true, but at best only part of the truth.'

The modern fashion is for agnosticism, which panders to laziness because it entitles a man to do what he likes (since he can always claim to know no better), and apes humility, because to the assault of the believer he can always say with profuse apologies, 'I wish I could believe that, but in all honesty I must admit I do not know.' Agnosticism is the most abject of creeds. It is in the nature of the human reason to come to conclusions even if provisional and false. At least it can be demonstrated that as a philosophy of life agnosticism fails its adherents. Its one apparent advantage is that it shelves all questions. But questions cannot be shelved in a life of three score years and ten.

Life does not wait for certainty. There is no such thing as doing nothing. You must live your life on one assumption or another—that you are a mere effect like the bloom on the peach or the noise of a whistle or that you are an originating cause; that you are annihilated by death or survive; that life is a succession of adventitious experiences or a positive moral adventure. But life must be lived, and the story of your life will reveal in the end what your assumptions have been, even if you were unaware of them yourself.

The religious outlook is based on an acceptance of all the facts of experience and not on a selective set of experiences. Pride and shame, guilt and innocence, justice and injustice, vice and virtue, cruelty and kindness, beauty and ugliness, are facts to be accepted and fitted into your scheme of things, not to be explained away. The experience of the spirit is a fact as real as the experience of indigestion, and the fact that they can be experienced by some person is at least as important in its implications as the fact that they bear some relation to the chain of cause and effect.

This is the substance of what Captain Hogg says of his own belief. The emotional and spiritual aspect of faith he says little about, though he suggests that this came to be a real factor in his acceptance of the corporate faith of traditional Christianity. We should like to have heard more of it, though the writer hints that to describe one's religious experience is rather like undressing in the street, not very decent and sometimes not a little ridiculous.

Then comes the interesting second question: What difference an acceptance of Christianity ought to make to a man's political outlook. And here the writer makes, and emphasizes, one special point. The world, he says, is full of politicians or preachers who wish to equate Christianity with a party programme. 'To me at least these enthusiasts have never brought much conviction—and sometimes even their motives seem to me questionable—the politicians as over-anxious to rope in the vote of the churches, the preacher as eager to persuade the public to return to a Church which offers to ally itself with a popular movement.'

The truth is that of any given problem there may be more than one solution which satisfies the golden rule. Christians have taken opposite sides in the past and will continue to do so out of genuine disagreement about ends and means. It follows that there is no Christian solution of world problems, and if there were such a solution there would be no chance of its acceptance, if only because real Christians form a very small minority

of the population. We are warned clearly of this in the Bible. Christians are to be the leaven in the lump, the salt of the earth. They must be in the world, not out of it. There should be Christians in every party.

And there is another point specially emphasized, not unconnected with what has just been said. 'If one thing is certain, it is that if there had been no sin there would be no war, no poverty and no idleness, and there would be a great deal less disease. The Christian is as entitled as a motor mechanic to say that if you persistently disregard the maker's instructions, if you will pour foul water into the radiator, refuse to grease the points, drive on your tyres and on your brakes, cut your corners and turn without warning, trouble of some kind will assuredly come of it for you, your fellow-passengers and other perfectly innocent users of the road.'

The task of the Christian in politics is to apply himself like any other man to the development of common-sense remedies for admitted evils. But it is also his duty to strive for a restoration of the moral standards of good faith, generosity, kindness, chastity and moderation in all transactions, public and private, with which he comes into contact. If he thinks that as a Christian he is more likely to hit on a cure for war or unemployment, he is likely to be disappointed. There will be many readers of this book who will differ strongly from the statement just made. But all will agree with the words that follow: 'That as a Christian he is bound to seek a cure in good faith, he may have no doubt.'

The New Order.

XVI. Ruin and Rebuilding.

By Professor John Foster, D.D., Selly Oak Colleges, Birmingham.

Two men were bewailing the passing of the good old days. 'Ah, things aren't what they were,' said one. 'No,' replied the other, not to be outdone in pessimism, 'and what's more they never have been.'

It is a difficult task to take stock of one's own time without either overvaluing, because it is one's own, and some of the pieces have a sentimental value beyond the market price; or undervaluing, because familiarity breeds—well, undervaluing, if not contempt. Professor Latourette suggests that from 1914 on may be the fourth period of ebb-tide in Christianity's history.[1] It is hard to be sure because the world is so wide, and the Church is now as wide as the world. In this country congregations are reduced, but on the American continent one hears of advance in church-membership. In Europe the problem is how to re-educate German youth from their new paganism. But in China it is old paganisms which are dying. The 'Three Religions' are no longer for educated men Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. The modern counterpart of Confucianism is Scientific Humanism. The extreme *laissez-faire* of the Taoist recluse is superseded by the omnicompetence of the State in the doctrines of the Communist reformer. And the third choice is another religion from without, Christianity. In Russia, before the recent *rapprochement* between Church and State, a generation had grown up, many of whom were strangers to the Christian religion except for the comic strips in the newspapers and the exhibits of the Anti-God Museum. In India, on the other hand, the most downtrodden proletariat in the world has been pouring into the Church by the hundred thousand. In the occupied countries there has been destruction of church property and persecution of Christian leaders. But in Holland as its liberation began I was told of religious revival which has marked the period of occupation. In Norway and elsewhere the Church has led in keeping alive the spirit of independence. Setting one thing against another, it is impossible yet to say on which side the balance will come down.

We cannot hope to be scientifically exact in our conclusions. We cannot even cover the whole field in our survey, since 'the field is the world.' This article will attempt some observations about periods of ruin in general, and a later one will select one or two particular points for examination.

Just before the crossing of the Rhine, I visited the British Liberation Army, and travelled through Belgium and Holland into Germany. A Canadian Colonel who had seen Caen and Falaise told me that 'Jerry didn't know what he was talking about when he spoke of total war. And we didn't really show him till we reached German soil.' The piled rubble of one of those first German towns seemed to say the same to me. This is a time of ruin, across Europe and Asia. Was there ever such a period as ours?

[1] *The Unquenchable Light*, ch. 8 on. See also my *World Church*, 110 f.

The answer is, Yes. There have been catastrophes before which have moved east and west, right across the world. One of the exciting things about history is this: With regard to the present we are little people, seeing no further than the small horizon provided by the five-foot-something of eminence at which we stand. History is that which enables us with regard to the past to mount up with wings and survey broad scenes, 'looking before and after.' We are able for a moment to see, as it were, with the eyes of God. We can see what such periods of ruin have meant in history, and in the history of religions.

In the East, China was at the height of its glory and power in the Han Dynasty, *c.* 200 B.C. onwards. This civilization was overwhelmed *c.* A.D. 220 by a Central Asiatic people called by the Chinese *Hsiung-nu*, and by us Huns.[1] For more than three and a half centuries the Dark Ages have come for China. That is not so long as ours in the West, but it is a set-back to civilization, a ruin requiring rebuilding.

The Roman Empire was in decline from the same third century A.D. Its chief external danger was from the barbarians on the Rhine-Danube frontiers, the German tribes. (But be careful how you underline that. Our own ancestors were among them.) They were pressing upon the frontier, sometimes over it. Their move to west and south was due to the advance across Western Asia of another branch of that same people, the Huns. We sometimes speak of the 'shrinkage' of the world, as though its unity were some new achievement. Calamities on an almost world-wide scale are there in medieval history. The Huns were nomad horsemen, little in stature, but terrible in appearance, with matted hair and wild eyes; sturdy, fierce, and with a whirlwind charge in battle which nothing could withstand. The Roman Empire crashed later than the Chinese. The year 410 sees the Fall of Rome before the Goths. The Dark Ages in the West last six centuries.

Now what of religion in all this? In the East, this is the opportunity for Buddhism to get in. It had long been expanding northwards over the passes in the Himalayas, and east across Central Asia. But China was proud, self-contained, self-satisfied. While the glory of the Han remained, it was a hard land for any religion of non-Chinese origin to penetrate. The same was true of China in the early nineteenth century, the period of the Protestant pioneers. But after the Fall of the Han China was weak and divided. The old civilization was in ruins. The old self-sufficiency was gone. All the guards were down. And in went Buddhism, to do what no religion had done before. None but Christianity has begun to do it since. Buddhism went in, in to stay, to become fully naturalized, China's own, and for many centuries among China's religions the most vital. The period of ruin provided the opportunity.

The Western result is well known to us all. The origins of Christianity lay within the Roman Empire—there was no problem of getting in. But it began in the most distant Oriental province and among men of a despised and subject race. It was the period of the decline which provided the opportunity. The Empire was dissatisfied with its old religions and open to new. The most living new ones were the Mysteries, mostly of Eastern origin. The ancient world knew no society without its religious sanction. This emphasis had been foremost in Roman religion. Born in this family, a man's duties were to the household gods and the shades of his ancestors. An inhabitant of this city, he worshipped its guardian gods upon whose blessings he must depend. As all the Mediterranean world was unified under the rule of the one city-state, Emperor worship provided the required sanction for the Empire. In the Mysteries we see something far different. A man is no longer content with being a son, a citizen, a subject. It is not family, city, state, which supremely matters, but the fact he is an individual with his own life to live, sorrows to endure, death to die. Here is religion not of the community into which one is born, but of a new community into which one is re-born. There is choice, or (if you like) conversion; then initiation, often some sort of baptism; and one belongs, not only in this life, but in the life to come.

Among these new religions of re-birth, there was one which was to outstrip them all. Semitic in origin, it had a crucified malefactor as its Saviour God. What strange reversals of fortune the decline of a civilization can bring! 'These that have turned the world upside down are come hither also.'[2] The gibbet of the Crucified is emblazoned on the standards of the legions. The mark of a slave's death becomes the sign whereby an Emperor shall conquer.

The period of ruin provides the opportunity. It must be so. It can be little use talking of fundamental things when the walls are up and the roof is on. Ruin, and its consequent rebuilding—that is the time for those who have a message concerning

[1] The real Huns were of Tartar stock. The misuse of this term for the German, with his policy of frightfulness, dates from 1900, when their own Kaiser told the German contingent of the Boxer Punitive Expedition, 'No quarter will be given, no prisoners taken. As the Huns one thousand years ago . . . so may the name of Germany become known. . . .' (Morse, *The International Relations of the Chinese Empire*, vol. iii. 309.)

[2] Ac 17[6].

the One Foundation. I give you the Apostle's own words—'Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ.'[1]

But this does not mean complacency. For opportunity is not always taken. And from history, indeed from facts behind that Eastern War which still remains to be won, we can see something of what may happen then. The first nation of the East to realize that the impact of Western nations had brought its old life to ruin was Japan. The Meiji Restoration of 1868 has as its chief significance the resolve of her bureaucratic leaders to rebuild as a Great Power. Picked Japanese youth was sent out across the world with the instructions, 'Learn how it is done. Come back and do it here.' They saw that the finest fleet in the world was Britain's. They modelled their new navy so closely upon ours that if you saw it (what is left of it) to-day you would still recognize everything to be British except the ensign. Much the same is true of her efficient mercantile marine, where the traveller finds everything 'shipshape and Bristol fashion.' They saw that the finest army in the world was that of France—and after 1870 quickly revised their judgment. If you saw Japanese soldiers goose-stepping down the streets of Shanghai or Canton, you would say 'Made in Germany,' and so they are. For law she looked to us—and where better? We led the world in 1894 in acknowledging her achievement in copying our codes. We promised in five years' time to relinquish extraterritorial rights. 'The clans are abolished, and prefectures are established in their place.' So brief and to the point runs Japan's decree of 1871, marking the passing of a feudal society. The positive process of building a modern government was to take longer, and its results were to prove less satisfactory in our eyes. But in her stunted, overridden Parliament we ought none the less to recognize one of the strangest children of our Mother of Parliaments in Westminster. Perhaps above all else Japan was to be impressed with our solution of the problem of population. Indeed with tight little islands smaller, and a population larger than their own, we seemed to have no problem at all because of our industrialism.[2] It was as part of her programme for a modern navy and army that Japan had begun with 'strategic industries'—engineering, shipbuilding, and mining. State encouraged, controlled, and even subsidized, capitalism went on to develop cotton mills, silk filatures, and all the other light industries. The products of this sweated labour, if they did solve something of Japan's population problem, were to raise problems for all her competitors.[3]

This list is far from complete. Modern Japan owes many debts to Germany, the United States, and France. But so much of her 'design for living' came from here, so much that some twenty-five years ago, Dr. Sun Yat Sen wrote, 'We in the East have an island nation, which may be called the Britain of the East. That nation is Japan.'[4] In recent years as I have recalled those words, I have said to myself, 'God forbid!' Then I have wondered if it should not be, 'God forgive.' There was a stone which the builders rejected, and whose was the fault? Japan missed the best we had to offer, because nowhere in our national life was its fundamental presence obvious enough.

The Christian religion *is* fundamental, not necessarily to all that Japan admired, but to all that is most truly admirable. Modern Japan was as far as ancient Rome from imagining an order of society which was not dependent upon religious sanctions. Not the Christian religion, Japan selected a piece of primitive mythology from her own past, about the Sun Goddess, the divine descent of her Imperial line, the high destiny of her nation of super-men.[5] Here is an ideology which provides religious sanction for all her villainies. An opportunity missed at the time of rebuilding means, not that a chapter of history remains blank, unwritten, but that we have a monstrous evil where there might have been incalculable good—an evil against which we must continue to struggle and to sacrifice, until Japan is in ruins and this time half Asia with her.

Ruin — Rebuilding — Opportunity — Responsibility—such has been the sequence of our thought. With regard to the last, I recall that a fellow-delegate to the Madras Conference of 1938, remarked that of all the seventy national delegations he found the Chinese the most impressive. I asked him why. 'In the West,' he said, 'people are saying that the next war, if it comes, will be the end. In China it has come. But these Chinese Christians do not speak of it as the end. They regard the ruin of their national life as their opportunity to rebuild more nearly according to the mind of Christ.'

Some who are old may bewail the ruin of our world, 'Things will never be the same again!' It is for those who have the spirit of youth to say, 'By God's grace they never shall be.'

[1] 1 Co 3^{11}.

[2] Japan proper is half as big again. Her population is supposed to have been long stationary at about thirty millions—less than half that of the 1930 census.

[3] E. H. Norman, *Japan's Emergence as a Modern State*.

[4] *The Three People's-Principles*.

[5] See my *Then and Now*, ch. 5.

Literature.

CHRISTIAN SOCIOLOGY.

In a recent work, *Justice and the Social Order*, tr. by Miss Mary Hottinger (Lutterworth Press; 15s. net) Dr. Emil Brunner claims that while the Catholic Church possesses an impressive systematic theory of justice, Protestant Christianity has had none for some three hundred years past. That is one of the main reasons why, as he adds, the Protestant Church is so unsure of itself in questions of the social order. In this work he would attempt to establish a doctrine of justice on Protestant principles.

One cannot but surmise that the comparative neglect in the Protestant Church of the sociological implications of Christian principles has been largely due to concentration upon the evangelical message itself, which after all dominates the New Testament. It is perhaps significant that the sociological effort of Protestant thinkers appears to have come hitherto from the liberal rather than the conservative evangelicalism. But with the publication of this work one may justly say that liberal and conservative evangelicals are joining hands in this field, under the common conviction that the gospel of God's grace and the Kingdom of His love, high and heavenly as they are, cannot brook any delay in the struggle for earthly justice.

It is one of the merits of this work that it brings out very clearly the distinction between the justice or righteousness of God, as set forth in the New Testament, and that earthly or mundane justice which is linked with social institutions and systems. The first expresses itself in the Christian's love of his fellow men, the other in the desire—not necessarily Christian in source—to give every man his due (*suum cuique*). This earthly or mundane justice is the proper subject of these pages, and it is the author's contention that interpreted in the light of Christianity it offers the only solution of our sociological problems.

In Part I. he is concerned with the discovery of principles. There he analyses such conceptions as throw light on the meaning of justice: equality, inequality, freedom, individualism, collectivism, and others. Characteristic of this Part, and indeed of the work as a whole, is the use made of the federative principle. Federation is here understood as the concrete form of the true relationship between individual and community: fellowship in freedom, freedom in fellowship. It does not imply a community based on a contract or a union. It implies an *a priori* fellowship. 'The ideal is not the modern democracy, derived from the principles of Rousseau and based on the social contract and the sovereignty of the people, but a community such as the family, where there is an *a priori* fellowship, a primal law not set up by men and a primal authority not first instituted by delegation on the part of the individual members of the community.'

In Part II. the principles discovered are applied to some of the most vital domains of life—the family, the economic, the political, and the international orders—in which the question of justice is particularly important. But in these domains there are many problems that can hardly be brought within the scope of justice. For example, the problem of prices is one; as Brunner says, 'it lies on the extreme circumference of ethics, and on the borderline of pure technique.'

In this Part the author recurs to the federative idea of justice in its application to the international order. He is of opinion that an order of the peoples on a democratic basis is a Utopia so long as giant states and dwarf states exist side by side. The giant state he regards as the most insuperable obstacle to the formation of a supra-state unity. His own dwarf state (which he loves, and of which he is proud), with its union of cantons, seems to furnish him with a model of hope for the international order.

We are indebted to Brunner for another timely and stimulating book, written in his impressive repetitious style: and a tribute of thanks is also due to the translator, who has been successful in presenting the thought of the book clearly (no easy task in so complex a field) without losing the vigour of the original. W. Fulton.

CATHOLIC RECONSTRUCTION.

Prospect for Christendom: Essays in Catholic Social Reconstruction, edited by Mr. M. B. Reckitt (Faber and Faber; 12s. 6d. net).

Emphasis should be put upon the word 'Catholic' in the sub-title, not in the sense of 'universal' but in the attachment to a particular school of thought. The editor mentions two former essays with somewhat similar aims, one introduced by Bishop Gore and concluded by G. K. Chesterton and entitled 'The Return of Christendom,' the other the 'Copec' book; and admits that this new volume is in the tradition of the former. The 'Copec' book looked back no further than the previous century for its inspiration. The other book may be said to have looked as far back as the Middle Ages; it sought rather in Christian doctrine and tradition than in the ethical idealism of the age the sanction and the clue for the recovery of a Christian sociology. And that may be said to be the central theme of the present series of essays.

The writers (Dr. Demant, Mr. T. S. Eliot, Miss Ruth Kenyon, the Rev. David and the Rev. William Peck, and others) would not object to be called the 'Christendom Group.' They are mostly young and all of them 'Catholic.' As such they are conscious of being subjected to two criticisms. If they take their stand on the Catholic social tradition, they are dubbed romantic triflers; if they set forth ideas of reform they are accused of

making ' blue prints.' The editor disclaims the intention to reply to such criticisms, but in effect he proceeds (quite briefly and cogently) to do so. It is the purpose of this book, he says, to suggest, first, upon what grounds Christian social action can be taken which will be validly such, and, secondly, by what means society can move from where it is to-day to where it can reasonably hope to be to-morrow. The writers do not profess to issue a political or social programme. What they do claim is that they indicate a way of approach to the problems of the age which could be effectively constructive just in proportion as Christian opinion was rallied to the support of it.

Accordingly, the writers begin with ' Foundations,' go on to ' Vocation and Ministry,' ' Recovery in Politics,' and conclude with ' The Task Before Us.' In this review they deal with most subjects of human interest and importance in the true divine order—the family, culture, agricultural man and industrial man, finance, the State. The writers are well-informed, and there is a marked unity of outlook which has been secured by the fact that the book is quite definitely a group effort. Naturally, the contributions vary in quality and value. The purely theological ' foundation ' is not easy to read, and one wonders that, since the essays were freely discussed by all the members of the group, some effort was not made to render the first two (theological) essays more intelligible to the general reader. In this respect Mr. T. S. Eliot's essay on ' Cultural Forces in the Human Order ' is beyond praise both for its limpidly clear thought and for its delightfully clear style.

The only other criticism which can be made of the book, and it is not a serious one, is that the writers claim for a Catholic tradition, in the narrower sense of the word, a view that all Catholic believers, in the broad sense of the word, share. And if that be accepted, it must be said that this is a serious, competent, Christian treatment of a great theme. The book contains a message that is urgently needed at the present time, that God is the creator and sustainer of a true social order. This is God's world, and nothing in it—culture, finance, industry, family life—can flourish unless He is in it and working through it. If that message can get over to leaders of thought and action and to the common man we shall be far on the way to a Christian reconstruction.

F. J. RAE.

AN ATLAS TO THE BIBLE.

The Westminster Historical Atlas to the Bible (Westminster Press, Philadelphia ; $3.50 net), edited by Professor G. E. Wright and Professor F. V. Filson, with an Introduction by Professor Albright, aims at providing the general student with an up-to-date atlas covering all periods of Biblical history.

The book fills a gap in the present equipment of the non-specialist student. A vast amount of expert work has been done, especially in the field of Biblical Archæology, since Sir George Adam Smith's ' Historical Geography of the Holy Land " appeared in 1894. The new Atlas seeks to present the main results of this work in a simple and attractive form for the general reader ; each of the historical periods is illustrated by a map incorporating any new discoveries and by photographs of its famous sites and monuments.

Here are some examples of the new historical geography. For the route of the Exodus, Raamses (Ex 1^{11}) is now best fixed at Tanis, the ancient capital of the Hyksos, a few miles from the modern Qantir. From there the Israelites went to Succoth, thirty-two miles to the S.E. and probably to be identified with Tell-el-Maskhutah. From this point no place name can be certain, but, since Ex $13^{18.\ 20}$ appears to imply that Succoth was near the *Yam Suph* or Reed Sea (Red Sea is probably an incorrect identification of the translators of the Old Testament), it is argued that the crossing lay through a marshy region in the neighbourhood of the modern Lake Timsah.

Garstang discovered that Jericho had been destroyed in the fourteenth century, while the evidence points to a date for the campaign of Joshua a full century later. The solution here favoured is that Jericho fell, not to Joshua, but to relatives of Israel, perhaps from the Shechem area. The conquest of Canaan was a gradual one, though the climax came in the thirteenth century with the invasion of Joshua from the East.

Albright's excavations at Ai revealed that the city had been destroyed and never again inhabited more than eight hundred years before Joshua, whereas the ruins of Bethel, one and a half miles away, bear the marks of a violent destruction in the thirteenth century : ' The simplest explanation is that the capture of Bethel was transferred to Ai in the Book of Joshua.'

A great deal of familiar ground is necessarily covered again, but even where the archæologist has still no definite conclusions to offer (in none of the lands of the Bible is the period of diminishing returns in archæological research even in sight), his negative results are not without value : many Gospel sites, for instance, with which the tourist may be familiar, cannot be accurately identified. (What evidence there is points to the conclusion that ' the ministry of Jesus was deliberately limited to Jews, and was confined almost entirely to centres free from strong Gentile influence.')

There is a useful Index of subjects and an eight page Index of Biblical sites. The thirty-seven maps are models of lucid cartography.

MATTHEW BLACK.

WHAT UNITARIANS BELIEVE.

A Free Religious Faith (Lindsey Press ; 5s. net) is the work of a group of writers appointed as a Commission of the General Assembly of Unitarian and Free Churches, and is edited by Mr. Raymond V. Holt, M.A., B.Litt. Although it is not issued ' as an authoritarian statement of denominational belief,' it might be entitled ' What Unitarians Believe.'

The book falls, like all Gaul, into three parts.

Part I. is a summary of the main conclusions reached by these Unitarians on the meaning of religion, the problem of evil, immortality, Jesus Christ and the Christian Church. These twenty-nine pages contain the quintessence of the Unitarian faith. Here the writing is graceful, the thought clear; and if the conclusions do not always command our assent, they compel our intellectual respect.

Part II. which comprises the bulk of the book, consists of separate essays on the problems raised in Part I. This too represents the opinion of the group as a whole. Here most of the main intellectual issues for the Christian Faith are raised. Much is made of the 'scientific challenge'; there is a good chapter on the psychological attack on Christianity (Behaviourism, etc.); and the findings of Biblical Criticism (Eschatology and Form-criticism included) are discussed. This part is much 'heavier going.'

Part III. contains two papers representing individual points of view.

Of course the book contains much with which the orthodox Christian will not quarrel: for example, the section on Christian ethics, which is excellent. It is only when we get down to the central Christian issues like the Person of Christ, the Atonement, Human Destiny, and the like that we begin to see what Coleridge meant when he said that while a Unitarian may be a Christian, Unitarianism is not Christianity. Some quotations will show what is meant. 'The Incarnation is true of all men, or not at all.' 'Modern attempts to re-state the doctrine (of the Atonement) are based upon assumptions as to the super-human character of Jesus which Unitarians cannot accept.' 'A Unitarian is free to believe, or disbelieve, in a future life.'

The only authority which the Unitarians will accept is that of 'the Inner Light.' Miracles in the generally accepted sense are simply excluded. Jesus is commended to men primarily as a great ethical teacher, and if there is to be a Christology at all, it can be expressed in Theodore Parker's words: 'O Thou great Friend to all the sons of men.'

There is much in this book that we like. It is so palpably the work of truth-loving men; it is not afraid to bring the Christian Faith into the light of modern thought; it throbs with sincerity from beginning to end. But the *Credo* which it holds out to us is bleak, and the Christianity it commends is not that of the New Testament. These Unitarians (we must feel) have a very inadequate appreciation of the Christian insights of St. Paul, St. John, St. Augustine, and the other classical Christian thinkers.

A. M. HUNTER.

We have been deeply impressed by a book on African missions, written by a woman—*African Pattern*, Letters written to an Administrator, by Mary Stuart (Livingstone Press; 2s. net). As the title suggests, the book consists of a one-sided correspondence. The 'Administrator's' letters do not appear, and we can seldom gather more about them than we do from listening to a telephone conversation. But the writer's part is full of instruction and stimulus. You are constantly filled with admiration for the sheer ability of the thinking and writing, for the breadth of mind and capacity for sympathy and understanding she displays in every situation. Everything she says is intelligent, and it is always interesting. Happy the field that has such an inspiring, capable and human head. The sources of interest in this book are endless—pictures of travel, anecdotes of native heroism, glimpses into history, straight talk on the value of missions, all sorts of things. This is a cheap two shillings' worth. Buy it and read it.

Enjoying the New Testament (Longmans; 8s. 6d. net), by Miss Margaret T. Monro, is a book offered to those Catholics who, though familiar with the New Testament in selections, would like to make its acquaintance as a whole. It is conceived in the spirit of the words in the Encyclical *Spiritus Paraclitus* issued by Pope Benedict XV.: 'It is our desire that all the children of the Church should be inspired and strengthened by the charm of Holy Scripture, and so attain to the excelling knowledge of Jesus Christ.' The plan is to read the whole New Testament, as far as possible in whole books; and the books, supplied with brief 'introductions,' are arranged mainly in the order in which they were written. But, as the author explains, psychological or pedagogical considerations have at times taken precedence of strict chronology. (It should be said that the texts are not given.) The author further explains the stress she lays on the human element in the Bible; it is because her book is not meant to be taken alone, it is meant as 'a springboard for a dive into the living waters of God's Word.' It is certainly a very attractive book, and should admirably fulfil its purpose. As one might anticipate, in matters of authorship and date Miss Monro is inclined to follow tradition. Thus she ascribes Hebrews to St. Paul.

Is there any real hope of church union? Perhaps the question should be, Is there a real prospect of church *unity*? For that is the more important aim of the two. The author of *For Such a Time as This*, the Rev. H. G. G. Herklots (Lutterworth Press; 4s. 6d. net), certainly believes there is. His book (by the way the title is taken from Est 4^{14}: 'who knoweth whether thou art not come to the kingdom for such a time as this?') is largely concerned with contemporary efforts at understanding and co-operation, such as the two great Conferences on Faith and Order and on Life and Work. The author is full of enthusiasm, based on a real sense of Christian values, and if his estimate of the supreme necessity of the one big thing that matters were general, his lively expectation of closer unity would be well on the way to fulfilment.

A book on the Church that is both able and candid has been written by two hands, the Dean

of Exeter, Dr. S. C. Carpenter, and an anonymous 'Chaplain to the Forces'—*The Household of Faith* (Nisbet; 3s. net). Anything Dr. Carpenter writes is worth reading. He has a distinction of thought and a fascinating style that are very attractive. The book sets readers a problem in higher criticism, since there is no indication of the authorship of the different chapters. These are: What is the Church?, The Church and her Critics, The Church's Record, The Church and God, and The Church and You. These are all important subjects, and we should be sorry to have to assign the chapters to the two authors. We might venture so far, however, as to say that the chapter on 'The Church and her Critics' is the best in the book, and if the anonymous Chaplain can lay claim to it, we congratulate him. In that case he is worthy to be associated with so distinguished a colleague as Dr. Carpenter. The book is very well worth reading. Its theme is topical and of great importance, and its popular style will commend it to those average people for whom it is intended.

A book on religious education in the schools under the new Act and from the Church's point of view was very much needed. It is here in *The School without the Parson*, by the Rev. E. F. Braley, M.A., LL.D., Principal of the College of the Venerable Bede, Durham, Hon. Canon of Durham (Religious Education Press; 1s. 6d. net). The title is explained by the fact that under the new Act parsons can no longer inspect schools, and have no right of entry whatsoever. This is probably a wise rule, owing to the feeling on the part of the teachers against inspection by members of another profession. The more one knows, however, of the inside of school life the more one feels that some kind of inspection is essential to secure that the job is actually honestly done. If this privilege is withdrawn from parsons there is a big compensation. Canon Braley points out 'the magnificent achievement of the Act, inasmuch as it establishes a religious basis for the national system of education. . . . For the first time in our history the Law of the land ordains that in every school the day shall begin with a corporate act of religious worship and that religious education shall be given to every child (unless its parents withdraw it).' This presents a great opportunity to the teachers, and Canon Braley proceeds to show how much can be done by the co-operation of the teachers and the clergy, by agreed syllabuses and by the proper training of teachers themselves. He realizes how inadequate their training has been and has a good deal to say on this subject. He very naturally makes no reference to the Scottish system by which a fairly thorough course of training has for the past twenty years been given to all teachers in the national Training Centres.

These are only a few of the topics dealt with in this competent book. The whole subject is handled with knowledge, breadth of mind and charity, and this handbook will help to answer many of the questions which the new Act and its provisions will arouse.

An admirable, broad-minded, well-informed and entirely Christian book on the religions of the world and their relation to Christianity has been written by the Archdeacon of Northam, Western Australia—*Many Creeds: One Cross*, by the Venerable Christopher E. Storrs (S.C.M.; 6s. net). The introductory chapter is on 'Christ and the Great World Religions.' Its general standpoint is that, besides the supreme revelation of God in the Bible, culminating in Christ, there has been a revelation through Nature, history, reason, and conscience. In other words, 'God has spoken unto the fathers by divers portions and in divers manners' and 'He left not Himself without witness' and in the eternal Word is 'the light that lighteth every man, coming into the world.' These great religions are therefore part of the revelation of God, an assertion that is poison to Barth whose idea is that God fulfilled other religions by contradicting them. Archdeacon Storrs faces squarely such questions as these: Why then evangelize other peoples? What value have other religions for Christianity? In what sense is Christianity unique? After this general discussion the book gives us special and informed studies of Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, Confucianism and Shinto. This is a book of extraordinary interest and value, and is a real gift for the ordinary Christian believer.

The Bible Speaks to Our Day, by Mr. George Barclay (Westminster Press, Philadelphia; $1.00), is not a general disquisition on the message of the Bible for the modern world; it is a set of lectures expounding certain passages of Scripture each of which is shown to be peculiarly relevant to the practical problems of the present crisis in history. One of the aphorisms of Principal Denney was that the preacher's task is to make the obvious arresting. These wholly admirable discourses prove again how greatly the discharge of this task is aided by taking a square stand on the Bible, and how a competent scholarship can find in the Scriptures a solid basis and content for a message to the present time.

Prayers for use by children are, apparently, so difficult to compose, and there are so few books containing efforts of this kind that are really good, that new experiments in this region are welcome. For this reason we mention *Worship (Suggested Outlines) for School Use*, by the Rev. W. Grainge White (procurable apparently from The Vicarage, Haughley, Suffolk). The value of such a book as this can be discovered only by experiment. The author has ideas of his own which he incorporates in his scheme. There are outlines of a school service for each day in one week, and the author's own theories are explained in prefatory matter and addenda.

The Christian Doctrine of Hope, and the Kierkegaardian Doctrine of 'The Moment.'

By the Reverend T. H. Croxall, M.A., B.Mus., F.R.C.O.,
St. Michael's Vicarage, Chiswick, London.

Of the three Christian virtues, Faith, Hope, Charity, Hope is the most neglected, perhaps the least understood. For myself at any rate, Kierkegaard's doctrine of 'The Moment' has greatly illuminated the Christian concept Hope, and the following lines are a brief attempt to show, in some measure, how.

Of the many Scriptural passages about Hope, I take as my starting-point, and as the background of my thesis, the passage in 1 P 1^{3-5} 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who according to his abundant mercy hath begotten us again unto a living hope by the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead; to an inheritance incorruptible and undefiled, and that fadeth not away, reserved in heaven for you who by the power of God are guarded through faith unto a salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.' It will be noticed that there are three outstanding features here emphasized about Hope: (1) it is begotten by God; (2) it is living; (3) it is closely related to an 'inheritance.'

1. *It is begotten in us by God;* or, *we are begotten by God unto it.* Now Kierkegaard's doctrine of 'The Moment,' takes its point of departure from Socrates. We find the doctrine frequently (for it is central to his teaching) in Kierkegaard's writings; philosophically it is set forth in his *Philosophical Fragments.* Socrates taught men maieutically; that is to say he was a 'midwife,' bringing ideas to the birth but not begetting them. Begetting is the work of God alone. All a human being can do for another in the sphere of knowledge (he taught) is to bring to birth ideas which are already present in embryo in the soul. Hence God Himself strictly prohibits Socrates from begetting—even if he could. *μαιένεσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γεννᾶν δὲ ἀποκώλυσεν,* says Socrates (*Theætetus,* 150). Kierkegaard quotes this passage,[1] and goes on to assert, what Socrates himself asserted, namely that the maieutic teacher (Socrates or anybody else) is of no importance, nor is the time (the moment) when the knowledge is brought forth, of any importance either. The only important thing is the knowledge. How then is this knowledge maieutically to be brought to the birth? Socrates would answer, by Reminiscence or Recollection. That is to say, the Socratic doctrine is that knowledge is already existent, though latently, in the soul. All that is needed is a stimulus, a 'midwife' to bring it out. The simplest illustration of this doctrine of Recollection, is in the *Meno* of Plato, where simple questions are put to a boy to prove the doctrine. Suppose, *e.g.*, we ask a child the nearest way across a square, from its south-east to its north-west corner. He will answer, by crossing it diagonally, not by going round two sides. How did he know this? The knowledge was already there. It only needed the stimulus of the question to 'bring it to the birth.' This simple mathematical illustration serves to show the principle. There is no piece of knowledge at all, which (however much it may seem to be implanted) can become truth for me, until something within me assents to the truth of it; until I can say 'Yes, I see that.' In other words, there is that within me already which responds to the truth presented to me, or asked of me, before it can become truth for me, become *my* knowledge. Eternal verities, which always form the stuff out of which knowledge, in the last resort, becomes possible, are verities whose truth can only be apprehended when they find an echoing abode in my soul. Eternity therefore is, in this sense, 'remembered.' It was there already,[2] and I must look back (so to say) by recollection into the depths of my soul, to find it; and I shall find it by my own human powers, aided, if need be, maieutically, by another. Therefore, as Kierkegaard puts it, the Socratic position is that I must 'remember backwards into eternity.' All that Socrates can do for me—it is the highest, and in the last resort the only, relationship possible between man and man in the sphere of knowledge—is to be a 'midwife.' That is why Socrates would never let himself be thought of as a teacher, standing away, so to speak, from his pupil, higher than he, trying to implant, or beget, knowledge into him, from his own superior platform. He himself was a learner, trying to bring out

[1] *Samlede Vaerker,* iv. 205.

[2] This fits in, of course, with the Socratic doctrine of the pre-existence of the soul.

(*e-ducere*) true knowledge everywhere. He therefore refused to 'make false and vain company with clever-heads, but felt himself just as much at one with a tanner.'[1]

Now Christianity, as Kierkegaard sees it, starting from the proposition that subjectivity alone is truth (a thesis of Lessing which Kierkegaard made his own; a thesis which, as we have seen, forms the foundation also of the Socratic position), sets off in the opposite direction from the Socratic direction. Socrates went back into the depths of memory for Eternity, Christianity goes forward to the future, in hope, for Eternity. 'We are saved by hope,' says St. Paul, 'hope that the creature shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption'[2]—into Eternity. Why this divergence of movement? Because the Person at the centre is different in kind from Socrates. Christ, who of course introduced Christianity into the world, is God, and God, as Socrates says, 'begets.' Christ is also Teacher. But He does not teach, like Socrates or any other human teacher, maieutically. God, through Christ's Spirit, *begets* in the pupil the very knowledge He teaches. An all-important difference appears. Whereas Socrates, as midwife, had but passing and secondary importance, God, who (working through Christ, and Christ through the Spirit) alone begets, has primary and permanent importance. The Teacher matters more than the teaching; for the Teacher is the way, the truth, and the life. He is the truth He begets; the only way to reach it is through Him; and without Him (as we shall see more fully in a moment) there is no life (in the Christian sense), and Hope is dead. With the Socratic form of knowledge, I can forget both the 'teacher' (midwife) through whom, and the moment in which, I received my knowledge. Not so in Christianity. The 'Moment' in which the Truth was begotten in me by God, is of supreme importance. Then I was 'born again'; and that not, as Socrates would affirm, in order to be brought out of a state of ignorance or error, but out of a state of guilt (sin).[3] The importance of the 'Moment' lies in the fact that then I laid hold on Eternity. Just as St. Paul speaks of the change from Time to Eternity happening 'in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye,'[4] so that therefore that moment is the supremest of all moments, when Time is transmuted into Eternity, so too, in my earthly life, when Eternity impinges upon Time and I am transferred from 'thinking like a man'[5] into grasping Eternity—that moment is of supreme importance for me, aye and must ever and anon be repeated. For Eternity, which in the 'Moment' I grasp, into whose realm I am transported, and by whose power I am transformed (just as truly as St. Paul envisages the temporal order transformed into the eternal order at the last trump)—Eternity is the Christian's true home, in which he must ever seek, and re-seek, to dwell, and for which he must ever be on a life-long quest—in hope. And yet, paradoxically, he can never, by his own unaided power, attain Eternity. It, and the hope of it, are begotten in us by God alone, and never achieved by man's effort, like the Socratic 'Recollection.' That is part of the Paradox, which, Kierkegaard constantly asserts, Christianity is.

2. So the Christian looks forward. Socratically one 'remembers backward.' That is why, in the second place, St. Peter speaks of Hope as 'living.' Only dead things have no future. The very term 'living' implies a future. Hope, therefore, is 'set before us.'[6] We must hope 'to the end.'[7] We have seen that it is begotten by God. How? 'By the resurrection of Jesus Christ from the dead,' answers St. Peter. The Resurrection is precisely the symbol, in Time, of the fact that Christ, who is God, is still living. It would indeed be strange if the Teacher, through whom God begets in us a *living* hope, were Himself not living. But, Christianity asserts, 'he ever liveth.'[8] He was 'declared to be the Son of God . . . by the resurrection of the dead.'[9] As living, because He is God, He is responsible for a *living* Hope.

But the historical fact of the Resurrection, like all sacred history, has to be appropriated, not by the intellect, but by faith—as Kierkegaard says, by the *leap* of faith. The 'leap' is necessary, Kierkegaard teaches, because of the infinite qualitative difference between Time and Eternity. Eternity is not just Time drawn out to infinity. It must not be thought of *uno tenore* with Time. A chasm divides the two, and the 'leap' of faith is necessary to reach Eternity from and in Time. That has always been so, as much for Christ's first disciples, who knew Him in the flesh, as for all subsequent ages. For Christ, as Kierkegaard puts it, is ever contemporaneous; and the difference between sacred and profane history, lies just in the fact that whereas profane history is over for ever, sacred history, like the Kobold, moves forward, as it were, with time, ever contemporaneous, and therefore an ever-present challenge. But that concept of contemporaneity is a large one in Kierke-

[1] *Ibid.*, iv. 205.
[2] Ro $8^{21.\ 24}$.
[3] Cf. iv. 207, 'Den forudgaaende Tilstand' with 221 ff. (*et passim*). Because of this antecedent state, God is both Teacher and Saviour—a thought I cannot expand here.
[4] 1 Co 15^{52} ἐν ἀτόμῳ, ἐν ῥιπῇ ὀφθαλμοῦ. Hence S. K. says 'the moment is not an "atom" of time, but of Eternity.'
[5] φρονεῖν τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων (Mt 16^{23}).
[6] He 6^{18}.
[7] He 6^{11}.
[8] He 7^{25}.
[9] Ro 1^{4}.

gaard's thought, and needs separate treatment.[1] The point to grasp at present is that, as regards the Resurrection, I can only know 'the power of Christ's resurrection'[2] in my own life, by the 'leap' of faith; only thus know Christ as living, contemporary, and with a living influence; know Him in fact, not only as the way, and the truth, but also as *life*, giving me—begetting in me—a *living* hope.

3. But lastly, St. Peter speaks of Hope as closely allied to 'an *inheritance*.' What is an inheritance? Something to which a person *was* an heir, but now possesses: for an heir differs from an inheritor in that he is the present possessor of his κληρονομία. Is St. Peter then inconsistent in speaking of the inheritance (present) as something 'reserved in heaven' (future) 'ready to be revealed in the last time'? No, there is no inconsistency, any more than it is inconsistent to speak of 'hoping to the end,' for what, in 'the Moment' we may grasp now, in Time. Hope can never, in Time, fully achieve its object, or know the full richness of it, ('incorruptible, undefiled, that fadeth not away'). 'Hope is a new garment (says Kierkegaard) starched, stiff, and glittering, but it has never been worn, and hence does not know how it will fit, and whether it will become one. Memory is a discarded garment, which, however beautiful it is, does not fit, since one has outgrown it.'[3] Not that Kierkegaard would have us be for ever (so to speak) trying on new garments, 'starched and glittering'! To be ever seeking something new, and never finding permanent satisfaction, is the fault of the 'æsthete,' of whom Kierkegaard speaks so much.[4] No, what is needed is an integrated personality wherein restless seeking gives place to peace, and such integration is ours, every time we grasp Eternity in 'the Moment,' and find our peace therein: and this is what Kierkegaard calls 'Repetition.' (But this category 'Repetition' means much more than this, and would take us too far afield to engage upon now.) 'The Moment,' in which the new birth takes place, is, paradoxically, not an isolated event which happens in us but once (like physical birth), but which is ever to be renewed; yet, at each renewal, ever new. For we have to admit with St. Paul, that now we only 'see through a glass darkly'; now we know only 'in part.' How could the finite mind grasp the whole riches of Eternity? That, says St. Peter, is 'reserved in heaven.'[5] What God 'begets us unto' in 'the Moment' in Time, is but a foretaste of it. But meantime, if we truly seek even this foretaste we are 'guarded by power of God.' Why, especially, do we thus need to be 'guarded'? Because, as St. Peter puts it, we can only pass 'through *faith* unto salvation,' *i.e.* full salvation which is 'ready to be revealed in the last time.' Faith, it is here clearly stated, is the medium for salvation, and faith, Kierkegaard teaches, always involves a 'leap.' That this must be so becomes clearer if we grasp what Kierkegaard teaches about the relationship between God and man. Monistic ideas, which make God merely supra-human, were wholly repugnant to Kierkegaard. God is qualitatively different from us. He cannot (as though immanent in creation) be apprehended *uno tenore* with other knowledge, but only (since He is transcendent) by an entirely new movement, viz. by a 'leap' of faith; a leap over the chasm which divides us from Him, just as we need the 'leap' to pass over the chasm between Time and Eternity. Unless we make that leap, we miss the 'salvation ready to be revealed (fully) in the last time'; miss, that is to say, our 'inheritance.' But leaping a chasm suggests danger; it produces perhaps 'fear and trembling.' Have we no protection? Yes, we are 'guarded by the power of God.' Safety, paradoxically enough, does not consist in standing on the shore, but in 'venturing out' (as Kierkegaard so frequently says); not in shrinking back, but in 'leaping.' We are safe to leap, however, because we are 'guarded by God.'

It is with an almost lyrical touch that St. Peter describes the 'inheritance.' It is 'incorruptible' (ἄφθαρτος), for is it not Eternity itself? It is 'undefiled' (ἀμίαντος), which means incapable of pollution; and how could Eternity be 'polluted'? It 'fadeth not away' (ἀμάραντος); and this word is used only here in the N.T., but comes in 'Wisdom' to describe a flower that never fades. Such an 'inheritance' the Socratic 'remembrance' can never quite give us; for Socrates came at it by human power alone, the power of 'midwifery,' whereby God-begotten knowledge is brought forth out of ignorance, truth brought forth out of error. But the Christian inheritance can never be discovered in us, and brought forth maieutically by human aid or by ourselves. God, through the Spirit of Christ,[6] begets Hope in us, bringing us, not merely out of ignorance and error, but out of guilt and sin, 'out of the power of darkness into His own marvellous light,'[7] 'out of the power of

[1] It is worked out in the *Philosophical Fragments* and in the *Unscientific Postscript* chiefly, though it occurs frequently elsewhere.

[2] Ph 3^{10}.

[3] iii. 194.

[4] Cf. all his 'æsthetic' works, especially *Either/Or* and the *Stages*. I should specially mention, as excellently illuminating the point I here bring forward, the section 'Rotation Method' in *Either/Or*, i. 293–314.

[5] Cf. also St. Paul 'the hope which is laid up for you in the heavens' (Col 1^{5}).

[6] Hence St. Paul 'that ye may abound in hope *through the Holy Ghost*' (Ro 15^{13}).

[7] 1 P 2^{9}.

darkness (translating) us into the kingdom of the Son of his love.' [1] It is His merciful provision, and not our merit; for Christ is not only Teacher, but Saviour. Hence St. Peter says in our passage, '*of His abundant mercy* He begat us again to a living Hope.' In 'the Moment' we are born anew to enter this kingdom, this 'inheritance,' which, though 'reserved in heaven' in its fulness, can yet be, to a degree, ours now by the 'leap' of faith; in which leap there is no danger, for we are 'guarded by the power of God' therein.

[1] Col 1^{13}.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Make Do and Mend.

By the Reverend H. F. Mathews, B.D., Runcorn, Cheshire.

'He appointed twelve.'—Mk 3^{14} (R.V.).

Has the craze reached your home, too? Placards in shop windows, speakers on the wireless, advertisements in the papers—all are counselling us to hang on to our clothes and belongings a little longer, and mend them up or make them serve another purpose. I don't know about you, but I used to be a bit fussy about wearing old things, but now I'm rather proud of the leather patches on the elbows of my jacket. They look almost like brave scars.

Of course, generally it is a woman's job: but the other day I was reading about a man whose inventiveness would be a lesson to the most careful housewife. Just over a hundred years ago James Evans was sent as a missionary to the Cree Indians. He found that the Redskins had no means of writing down the language they spoke; so he made up a set of characters, each of which represented a syllable instead of a letter as in our language—and that made it possible for the North American Indians to write and to read. Then he wanted to print things for them to read—Bibles and so on; but he was so far from civilization that it was out of the question to get a printing press sent. So he went to the fur trading stations and stripped all the thin lead sheets from the inside of their tea-chests. Then he carved little models in wood of the characters he had invented, made casts of them in soft clay, and finally poured the molten lead into these; so that eventually, after many failures, he produced his first set of type. Then he had no paper; but it took more than that to daunt James Evans. He stripped off the bark from the birch trees and found it was an excellent substitute. Last of all he made his printing press—out of an old jack-screw which had been used for baling furs. And so the Indians had their earliest literature.

It is marvellous how some people adapt themselves to their limitations and overcome their difficulties! Most of you will have heard the wonderful story of Helen Keller who, though she was blind and deaf and dumb from birth, has achieved fame as one of the best educated women of her time.

A friend of mine visits regularly a cripples' home in the town where he is a minister. He was invited to go to their Christmas dinner. As he was going up the steps he thought of one of the boys he had often seen there, who had no arms. It wouldn't be much fun for him, he thought, having to be *fed* with his Christmas dinner. But when he got to the table, he found the youngster sitting there quite happily, 'handling' his knife and fork with his toes! And after dinner he showed my friend some paintings he had done—and I only wish I could paint half as well.

The more I thought about these things, the more the words of our text kept coming into my mind. Yet they don't seem to have any connexion with what we have been talking about. Jesus, when the crowds had almost swept Him off His feet in their enthusiasm to be present at His teaching and healing, went solemnly away into the hill country, taking His chosen friends with Him—Simon, Andrew, Philip, and the rest. And there, Mark tells us, 'He appointed twelve' to be the first heralds of the good news about Him. How dignified it all sounds!

But the word Mark uses is not dignified at all. It is the ordinary, common word 'make.' Some of the ancient manuscripts from which our New Testament is translated repeat the phrase before they record the list of names of the Apostles. Mark seems to be suggesting something far more matter-of-fact than our English version hints. It is as though he were trying to say, 'Jesus *made do* with twelve men . . . and *made* them into the Twelve, that He might send them out to preach and to have authority to cast out demons.' It was not that Jesus just gave these disciples their high office as apostles. He made do with the unpromising material they were—Peter with his excitable inconstancy, Philip with his unredeemed business instinct, John and James with their selfish and rather imperious natures, even Judas to whose apostleship there came such a tragic end. But Jesus took these unpromising characters and *made* them into the men He wanted them to be; so that Peter should become the leader of the Early Church, and James and John should be able to look back and laugh at the old nickname He gave them—Boanerges.

That is what Christ does with all of us who come under His sway. By ourselves we are not very great people; certainly not the people of whom the Kingdom of God is built. But Jesus can make of us the instruments of His purpose.

When Paul was very pessimistic about his failure to be the man he felt he ought to be, he turned to himself and said, 'Oh, what a wretch I am'; but when he sat down to think out the way in which Christ had used him in His service, he was bold enough to exclaim, 'I can do all things through Christ, which strengtheneth me.'

A Jesus Man.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'We shall be like him.'—1 Jn 3^2.

Some time ago it was my privilege to preach in Oxford. I was put up while there in the house of the Principal of one of the historic Oxford Colleges, Jesus College. One night in the course of the conversation I asked the lady of the house whether any prominent men had come out of Jesus College. She mentioned immediately one student of it, whose name is almost a legend now. 'Oh,' she said, 'Lawrence of Arabia was a Jesus man.'

'A Jesus man.' Isn't there another meaning in that? It would be a wonderful tribute, wouldn't it, were one worthy of being spoken of in that sense too, as one in whose life there was something of the likeness of the Master? As a matter of fact some one once said Lawrence of Arabia was also that kind of man. An American Professor, when visiting England on one occasion, paid a call on Thomas Hardy, who was one of our most celebrated writers, and his wife. Among other things Mrs. Hardy told him that Lawrence often stayed at their house, and she said that in his personal character and habits of life and speech he was 'more like Jesus Christ' than any person she had ever known. So that seemingly as well as having the honour of being called 'a Jesus man' because he was at Jesus College, Lawrence was 'a Jesus man' too, because he bore in himself something of the likeness of the Lord Jesus.

It isn't, however, only world famous figures like Lawrence of Arabia who may earn such a name. Others of whom the world has never heard have earned it, too. In a very poor part of the East-end of London up a dark and dismal stair there lived a mother with four children, the oldest one being about ten. Unfortunately the husband and father was away at sea and his wife hadn't heard of him for a long, long time. So she battled on bravely herself to support the home. One morning she fell ill and wasn't able for work. She was very distressed what to do about the bairns. In the afternoon, however, on some one knocking at the door, the small girl of ten answered the knock, opened the door, and came running in, shouting with a glowing smile on her face:

'It's all right now, Mum, 'cos the Jesus woman's come.'

And who then was this woman? She was some one who wore a poke bonnet with a red band across it and on it the words 'Salvation Army,' for she was one of those wonderful people who in Jesus' name care for the poor and rescue the perishing. And wasn't that small girl right in referring to her as 'the Jesus woman,' for she went about doing the good Samaritan sort of things Jesus did.

And to be worthy to be spoken about as this should be your aim and mine as well. In order to be so we must have something about us of the likeness of Jesus, what the Apostle Paul spoke of as 'the marks of the Lord Jesus,' such marks, you know, as uprightness and honesty, kindness and love. And He Himself said that this was how others would *see* that we were worthy of His name—

They that have my spirit,
These, saith He, are mine.

The Christian Year.

Twelfth Sunday after Trinity.

The Pattern.

By the Reverend A. W. McClymont, D.Litt., Edinburgh.

'Then David gave to Solomon his son the pattern of the porch, and of the houses thereof, and of the treasuries thereof. . . . And the pattern of all that he had by the spirit, of the courts of the house of the Lord.'—1 Ch $28^{11.\ 12}$.

This is a fascinating incident in a life full of incident. It tells of a legacy from father to son, a legacy of action as well as a heritage of dreams.

It was surely most natural that David should pass on to his son the material and information accumulated by him for the building of the Temple to God, a Temple worthy of all that he had learned God could be. To himself had been denied an achievement that lay close to his heart. Like so many he had been kept busy with tasks that simply had to be done, tasks uncongenial often, always hard, while at the same time his thoughts would fain be engaged in other matters. He had to use a sword when he would much rather have wielded a trowel. He must fight these brutal Philistines when he would rather have set stone to stone in a stately edifice to the glory of God. His dreams were so different from his duties. Those duties he could not and did not shirk, though it is probable that they coarsened his life and denied him what he longed to accomplish. And so time had run on. His dreams must wait for another generation. Therefore to Solomon his son David gave the pattern of all that he had by the spirit.

In what mood was the gift received, in what mood bestowed? What did Solomon think of it all? Did he resent in any way having this scheme planted on him, his future mortgaged, and his freedom fettered? Parental advice is not always welcome. One generation does not too willingly take over the legacy of the previous generation, though that legacy is often richer than is confessed by the recipients. Well, we don't know what Solomon thought. Possibly, like the wise man later events showed him to be, he perceived it

would be foolish to show any resentment. The plans of his father, precise and detailed though they might be, left room for initiative, the expression of character, the use of new resources.

And in what mood was this legacy handed over? It would certainly be a misrepresentation of David to picture him as a domineering father. In one instance the reverse was the case, for as an indulgent parent he had suffered cruelly. The fond foolish father had lost his heart and well nigh his life to his spoilt boy Absalom. No doubt he had learned his lesson in that tragic business. The reins would now be held with a tighter grasp but not too tightly.

What was the pattern that David gave to his son? The preparation he made was not simply an accumulation of material things, great as that store was. In his character and in his religion he left a more wonderful pattern. What is more illuminating than the words 'And David said to Solomon his son, Be strong and of good courage and do it: fear not, nor be dismayed; for the Lord God, even my God, will be with thee.'

Two threads are clearly seen, **personal faith** in God and **personal courage**; these furnish the most striking colours in the king's design for living. In addition we note a foresight that prepares for tasks that lie far into the future, a patience that wearies not though fulfilment of his dreams is long delayed, a penitence that submits to chastisement when wrong has been done, a humility that surrenders to duty or steps aside from pleasure and leisure to choose the unwelcome and tedious path. How rich an inheritance to pass on to the next generation! Do we find both rebuke and inspiration in such a picture? Silver and gold and precious stones we may not have to bestow. But spiritual riches have come down to us through the fidelity and sufferings of our fathers: have we used them to build up the House of God, have we added to the store, or diminished it for the use of those who are to come after us?

Personal courage, thank God, still endures among us. To look about us to-day is to witness such a display of heroism as confounds the critics dubious of what the years of pleasure and indulgence between the wars might have brought forth. Those of us who are forced to be spectators only are both humbled and thrilled.

What of the second quality in David's pattern of life? Faith of a kind we have, though it is often vague enough. We are urged to greater faith from many quarters. We must believe in *ourselves*, in our *race* and its mission and destiny. We have been lacking in these 'lesser loyalties,' we are told, so that our lives have become shallow, without sure foundations, without strong and living convictions. There is some truth in these judgments and exhortations. But it is easy to see the danger of these beliefs by themselves. Belief in oneself, instead of a conviction of the worth of each personality, may become arrogance and the assertion of the supreme authority of one's 'intuitions': while belief in one's nation, instead of a call to service, may become a savage and ruinous contempt for 'lesser breeds without the law.' Beyond these beliefs we must go for a corrective and determinative power. For David the source and object of faith is clearly set out in the majestic words: 'Thine, O Lord, is the greatness, and the power, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is thine; thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all.'

Such a personal faith is weakened by the doubts we have of Providence, whether or not God has a plan, a purpose, whether we can trace a pattern in this mysterious universe where sin and suffering play so unrestrained and poignant a rôle. Pagan philosophies found it hard to see in history anything more than just one event following another. Secular historians of to-day hesitate about their verdict. Yet Mr. Fisher in his wonderful survey of European history admits 'the fact of progress is written large and plain on the page of history. . . . But progress is not a law of Nature.'

Progress is not a law of Nature, but it is surely the purpose of God. Much in history that is important can be overlooked for one reason and another. I am told the *Cambridge Modern History* has practically no reference to the world missionary movements that swept across the world from these islands in the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth, although it is obvious that in China, India, Africa, great native Churches have come into existence, that out of Christian teaching have appeared in these lands new ideals of unselfishness, toleration, care of the sick, the aged, and the helpless.

What if God has given us a pattern, and also liberty, an accumulation of material for the working out of our destiny, so much wealth and wisdom to build a Temple of surpassing beauty, and we are left free to use, to misuse, even to lose all our great heritage!

The Christian story should make plain that we have a Father in heaven who has given His children a pattern, setting it before us in the utter devotion and triumph of our Master.

What is your pattern, your design for living? Principal Oman said 'Only the youthful have ideals,' forgetting that if young men see visions, old men dream dreams. Courage and Faith, these came to David 'by the Spirit,' not a natural endowment, nor evolved by ingenuity. We, more than David, can ask for the Spirit to cleanse, renew, rebuild our character, our Church, our State.

Let us forget the things that vexed and tried us,
The worrying things that caused our souls to fret,
The hopes that cherished long were still denied us,
Let us forget.

Whatever things were good and true and generous,
Whatever of right has triumphed over wrong,
What love of God or man have rendered precious,
Let us remember long.

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Silver Gleam.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'And the cup was found in Benjamin's sack. Then they rent their clothes.'—Gn $44^{12.\ 13}$.

The moment when these men caught the gleam of the silver in that morning sun was the turning-point in the story of a crime and its consequences. That old, sad story had opened twenty years earlier when these ten sons of Jacob, in their jealousy, abandoned their brother, Joseph, to his fate. 'Come,' said Judah, 'and let us sell him to the Ishmeelites.' But Joseph did not die. And now, twenty years after, they had come to buy corn in Egypt, and had they but known it, the dispenser of that bounty was none other than Joseph against whom they had sinned so long ago.

On this occasion they had brought with them their youngest brother, Benjamin. Before they turned for home again Joseph ordered his officers secretly to put a piece of the Egyptian regalia, the governor's silver divining cup, in one of the sacks of corn. He sent his steward in pursuit, who told them that there was reason to suspect that one of them had stolen the governor's cup. The brothers protested and said: 'Search us. Let the sack of corn of every one of us be opened.' To their consternation, when the last sack was examined, there was a gleam of silver. The cup was found in Benjamin's sack.

This is much more than the story of a single family: it is the concentrated drama of the human race and of God's dealing with human sin. In it we can trace the silver gleam which runs through all history and through every human life.

(1) To Benjamin the silver cup was **a Thing of Beauty.**

Benjamin was innocent of that twenty-years-old crime of his ten brethren. He was only a small boy when the sin was committed, and though brought up in the shadow of it, it may be that he had not been told all the sordid details.

In itself this cup was a very precious thing, all the more so because of its meaning and purpose. It was the governor's own divining cup, and when he gazed into its silver depths he could read, by an art no longer known to us, the will of God in the ways of men. It was, as it were, a link between the human and the divine, a point of contact between God and man. And little did Benjamin dream that day when he left for home that he carried with him a gift of the gods.

For it was a gift. He had neither begged, borrowed, nor stolen it. He had not worked for it, or earned it, or deserved it. It was something given, not gotten. Many of the things which you and I possess are ours because we have worked for them and earned them. They are like the corn in the brethren's sacks, things that our own money has bought, our own sowing has reaped, our own seeking has found. But there is one thing we have for which we have neither toiled nor spun. Like the silver in the sack, it is something given, not gotten.

Very early in the Bible that something given is called the 'image of God.' That image may have been defaced, its lustre tarnished, but it is there. Wrapped up in the corn of our achievements and hidden among the chaff of our failures there is in every man the silver gleam, the something given, not gotten. The New Testament is more explicit about this gift of God to men: 'To them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name.' That is God's gift to every man, the possibility of becoming a son of God, the power to respond to the saving grace of God so that you and I and every man may become what God wants us to become.

(2) But to the ten brothers the silver cup was **a Thing of Torment.**

They little dreamed that the great governor who had entertained them so lavishly was their very own brother whom, long ago, they had so heartlessly abandoned. Yet in all that splendour they were ill at ease. 'The men were afraid because they were brought into Joseph's house.' What was it that darkened even those sunny hours? It was the shadow of a crime falling adown the years, and the sudden gleam of silver in that morning sun only gathered up to a point of intensity what had been there all along, the memory of that old, sad sin and the fear lest the innocent, too, should suffer. A thing of beauty become a thing of torment! 'And the cup was found in Benjamin's sack. Then they rent their clothes.'

How can we say: 'This thing that I see is ugly'? It is because we have in our hearts a feeling for the beautiful. And that is a gift of God. How can I say: 'This word that I speak is a lie'? It is because we have in our minds an idea of the truth. And that is a gift of God. How can I say: 'This thing that I do is evil'? It is because we know better. And that is a gift of God. He hath shown thee, O man, what is good. It is not the sin alone which brings the misery, it is knowing that it is a sin. It is the knowledge that turns sin into guilt, that is what brings the torment. And we could not have that knowledge unless it had been God who had made us, and unless it were that it is to Him we belong. It is the silver gleam that throws the shadows.

(3) And to Joseph, under providence, it was a **Thing of Power.**

There is one incident in this story which offends our susceptibilities. It is the incident of the silver cup. We wish it had not happened just like that. Was it kind, was it fair, thus to play a trick not only upon the guilty but upon the innocent? And is not this indictment often levelled against God Himself? Do not the ways of divine providence often seem to us to be unfair, unjust, and sometimes cruel? If we knew all that God knows and saw all that God sees, would that indictment stand?

We who read this narrative have one advantage denied to the brothers. We know the whole story. We know, at least, what Joseph knew. We know that it was he who owned the cup and we know

what his motive was. Joseph's motive was to give the guilty brothers another chance, a chance to right the wrongs of the past, to heal its wounds, to re-unite their father's house whose happiness their sin had marred. But underneath it all was the deepest motive of all, one of which even Joseph himself was unaware, the overruling of the affairs of men to the fulfilment of God's ultimate design. Joseph could not bring this about alone, he must have the co-operation of the guilty. He must discover whether, in their hearts, there still remained the one gift that counts, the gift of being able to take another chance, of responding to an offer of love and mercy. There was one way, and, in that time and place, only one—it was the test of the silver cup.

If that test had failed? If the history of twenty years were to repeat itself, and they had said: 'The cup has been found in Benjamin's sack. He is the guilty one. Let him take his punishment, we wash our hands of him'! But that is not what happened. What happened was that Joseph found what he was really seeking, the gleam of silver, not in the corn but in their character. 'If you take Benjamin,' they said, 'you must take us. We will stand by him whatever happens.' Then out stepped Judah—the very one who, twenty years before, had said of Joseph himself: 'Let us sell him to the Ishmeelites,'—out stepped Judah and said: 'Benjamin is guilty, but he is our father's dearest child. Set him free and take me instead.' That was the real silver gleam for which Joseph had been seeking, the real point of contact between a forgiving God and sinful men, the willingness to respond to the second chance offered by the love that sought them. And so the house of Jacob was restored and brought back again into the main line of the divine purpose, and the turning-point of the drama centres around an incident of which we said: 'It ought not to have happened!'

Does that indictment against the providence of God still stand? Is God responsible, or not, for this or that event which we call unnecessary, unfair, unjust? And there is the Cross itself, the focus point of our deepest problems and perplexities. Why should the innocent suffer? Does God send sorrow, or does He only 'allow' it? Did God will the death of my loved one, or did He just stand apologetically aside? Insoluble problems? Yes; but it is so easy to find for oneself, and more tempting to give to others, the soothing but evasive answer. God's task is so immense—Paul once said that it is no less than that of leading the world to repentance—that He must take the long view and look farther than our material or mental comfort at the moment. Indeed, on looking back, even we can see that many an incident which seemed at the time to be cruel has turned out to be kind, and that many an event which we wished had not happened proved to be the pivot upon which the whole issue for good had turned. I would rather believe, as Jesus in the original tradition did, that not only my joys but my sorrows, too, are sent to me by the will of God rather than by the will (or caprice) of any other, and that, running through the tortuous ways of human history and winding through the troubled life of every man is the silver gleam of God's purpose, and that that purpose always is one of redemptive love.

It may be that we are letting ourselves be bullied by our feelings, if not by our 'brains,' and so miss the truth because we are afraid of it. If we knew a little more of what God knows, if we loved a little more as God loves and if we suffered a little more as God suffers, perhaps we should have the courage of the old Calvinists who dared to trace in everything the moving of God's finger and the working of God's will.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Thanks Which Cost.

BY THE REVEREND W. H. MURRAY WALTON, M.A., VICAR OF BROMLEY, KENT.

'The sacrifice of thanksgiving.'—Ps 116^{17}.

Thanksgiving has been much in our thoughts of late; just as sacrifice has been uppermost in our mind during the long drawn out years of war. After a terrible struggle we have escaped the greatest peril that ever faced our land, and now with our Allies we have won the completest victory in our history. Small wonder then that

> 'We were like unto them that dream.
> Then was our mouth filled with laughter,
> And our tongue with singing: . . .
> The Lord hath done great things for us;
> Whereof we are glad.'

'Sacrifice . . . thanksgiving'—we are prone perhaps to treat these as contrasts at such a time as this instead of realizing that in real life all true gratitude costs something. A word of thanks which crosses our lips and whose purpose is forgotten five minutes later cannot mean very much. Why then should our thanksgiving still demand sacrifice now that the war in the West is over?

That we have profound reasons for thanksgiving nobody can deny. In the first place our victory represents the victory of right over wrong. In most wars there is generally a good deal of right on both sides; but in this war we have been spared all doubt by the statement of war aims put forward by its chief instigator himself. (Hitler's *Mein Kampf* not to mention his speeches have put the issue quite clearly.) Whatever might have been the merits or demerits of National Socialism in its earlier days, as Amy Buller has pointed out in her striking book, *Darkness over Germany*, the movement was captured by gangsters. The issue then has been first and foremost a moral one; it was the consciousness of this fact which enabled us to stand alone for a whole year in direst peril as we faced the greatest military power in history.

But we are also full of gratitude because in this war we have seen in a peculiar degree the controlling hand of God. 'The miracle of Dunkirk,' who would describe it otherwise? 'But what

about the great loss,' says somebody, 'that the Allied Cause has sustained in the death of President Roosevelt? Surely here Providence has let us down.' One day I think we may see even in that mysterious happening the hand of God. We all realize that the one hope of world peace lies in the continued co-operation of the Great Powers. And yet magnificent as has been the part played by the United States in the war, at the back of our minds there has always been the question, Will she play as big a part in the peace? or shall we see a repetition of the events of 1919? Now Franklin Roosevelt by his courage and vision bequeathed to his people a great heritage. At the same time as President he was in continual difficulty with the Senate; only his political genius enabled him to overcome the obstacles he did. Yet there has always been lurking in the offing the possibility that in the final show-down the Senate might repeat their action of repudiating the Peace Treaty, which would follow this war; for the constitution of the United States demands a two-thirds majority in the Senate before any international agreement becomes binding. Now in the man called so unexpectedly to succeed President Roosevelt we have one who to a conspicuous degree possesses the confidence of this important body. He himself has been a senator; every Senatorial Committee he has presided over has brought in a unanimous report; better than any man he understands the temper of this Upper House. And if that were not sufficient, President Truman, himself a wholehearted supporter of international co-operation, is a son of the Middle-West, which has always been the home of isolationism. May we not reasonably hope then that with Roosevelt's prestige behind him, and his own special gifts, America's co-operation in world peace has become more certain because of the death of one whose loss at first we deemed irreparable? Truly

> God moves in a mysterious way
> His wonders to perform;
> . . . . . .
> Behind a frowning providence
> He hides a smiling face.

Both in cloud and sunshine, then, we have cause for thanksgiving. What then should be the nature of this thanksgiving? On VE-Day and the days that followed we kept our thanksgivings in a peculiarly British way—the thronged churches, the exultant but orderly crowds, the street parties, evidence of the good fellowship gendered by the war, the sense of a great deliverance and at the same time of a job not yet completed, and above all the consciousness of a tremendous task ahead without that shallow self-confidence which marred the years following the last war—somehow it was a thanksgiving which seemed to go deeper. Earlier in the war the crew of the *Theresa Boyle* shivered for fifty hours in icy weather in a tiny boat after a Nazi bomber had sunk their ship. There were ten men in the boat; eight lay on the boards too weak to row. Finally they were spotted by a plane which guided two minesweepers to the spot and the poor fellows were tenderly lifted aboard. But once below, their first thought was not for themselves. A signal flashed out from one of the ships just as the plane made off. 'Anything wrong?' came back the pilot's reply. 'No,' was the answer; 'only these fellows we have just picked up want to say "Thank-you."'

A 'thank-you' that costs! And if our thanksgivings at this time are going to mean anything, they must cost too. What then has been our attitude to the announcement that despite the ending of the war in Europe rationing is to be if anything more rigorous than before? Have we thanked God that by our continued self-denial the suffering peoples of the Continent are going to get a chance of regaining their strength with food we might justly claim for ourselves? As controls are relaxed and there are more things to buy, are we going to continue to give, as we did to the Red Cross during the war years, in order, for example, that the churches of the liberated lands may once more get upon their feet? They had to bear the brunt of the Nazi invader's attack to a degree we never experienced over here. And then there are our own bombed churches, are they who are immune going to echo the plaint of the vicar of one such, who in answer to his Bishop's appeal said, 'But I must get my own church painted first?' Or again, we thank God for the magnificent work done by our Indian and Colonial troops. But such service has meant a disruption in their lives far beyond our imagining. As they return to their village homes, disturbed in body and soul, are we planning to offer them the Gospel of the One who alone can satisfy their new hopes and visions? We were glad enough of their service in our hour of need, now in their hour will we offer them our services?

Sacrificial thanksgiving is indeed a very practical thing. It touches our bodies, our purses, our imagination, our will. Like David of old it prompts us to say: 'neither will I offer burnt offerings unto the Lord my God which cost me nothing.'

But such an offering, whatever be the precise form it may take, will find its finest expression in the offering of ourselves. It is no accident that in *The Book of Common Prayer*, at the close of the Communion Service, when we ask God 'mercifully to accept our sacrice of praise and thanksgiving' we go on to say 'here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee.' Great as have been the sufferings of the churches in occupied lands, the German Confessional Church is not one whit behind them. Their pastors too have tasted to the full the tortures of the concentration camps. Now in his moving story of one such church, John Maarten in his book, *The Village on the Hill*, describes the members, as they faced up to the Nazi terror, pledging their loyalty to their church and faith. They sealed this in the sacrament that followed. Thus the author describes the scene: 'I have never been at such a sacrament as that. We had the feeling of being really close to one another,

as members of a family are in a chimney corner at home. The differences we had had seemed as if they had melted away.' And then he goes on to say, in words which show how close is thanksgiving to sacrifice. 'You could feel this in the singing. The chorale had a new ring, full and joyous even though there was no organ.' For in the offering of themselves they had found the secret of their thanksgiving. And so too shall we.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The World Harvest and the World's Needs.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU.

'Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness, as to fill so great a multitude?'—Mt 15^{33}.

'But Jesus said unto them, . . . give ye them to eat.'—Mt 14^{16}.

The harvest of 1945 is somehow different from most other harvests in this respect that it is one that will be shared by us with many needy people in a generous and benevolent spirit. A few months from now many of the peoples of Europe may be in a serious plight through food shortage and they will be relieved and fed only if other more fortunate nations tackle the situation with willing minds and hearts. Except for their wise foresight and careful organization the black horse of the Apocalypse and his rider, representative of terrible food scarcity, will be seen stalking through the Continent of Europe.

After a global war with all the privations it entails, we, as Christians are bound to take a global view of the earth's resources and at the same time scan with merciful eyes the needs of our fellowmen. To-day we dare not indulge in meanness or in the sin of hoarding or holding up prices of grain. As a Christian nation we are compelled to think of the elementary needs of others and supply at whatever cost their radical necessities. To-day, as never before in the history of the world, have we felt the solidarity of the human race and known that we are truly members of one another, bound up in the self-same bundle of life. We cannot simply stock our granaries to overflowing: we must think of the resources of the earth in order to succour, ere it be too late, the hunger-stricken peoples who have known cleanness of teeth.

'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof.' This great declaration was probably in the minds of those who framed the fifth basic principle of the New Order—that the resources of the earth should be used as God's gift for all. This was not a political manifesto, it was a declaration made by the leaders of the British Churches. We cannot think of the world of 1945 or its riches except in terms of community. The Christian mind must envisage community, both local and universal, in all its thinking. Community is founded surely on 'neighbourship,' as it has been termed. This birth of a new and wider sympathy is a hopeful sign and we cannot precisely gauge the far-reaching effects it may have on recipient peoples in the way of reconciliation and good-will.

Keeping in view the narrative of Christ's feeding of the multitude, let us think more closely of the world harvest of 1945 and ask ourselves what its challenge to us may be.

1. Should there not be **a fresh realization of the resources of the world** that are available for needy nations? The fact is that God in His bountiful care has provided enough for all His children. There is enough and more than enough in the world for every living creature. There are perhaps two thousand million people on this earth of ours. But the natural resources of the soil permit of all having sufficient, and could provide work for all if they were worked. It is not God's fault if anybody goes hungry or out of work. 'Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.' 'The eyes of all wait upon thee; and thou givest them their meat in due season.' It is *man* whose hands are not open. It is *man* who by his greed and lack of imagination and sympathy frustrates the generous purposes of the Heavenly Father. According to one estimate, Continental Europe will need twelve million tons of imported food between August 1945 and August 1946 to improve diets and prevent large scale starvation. Should there be any fear that this amount will not be forthcoming, if the ample resources of the fortunate nations are resolutely tapped and if that situation is tackled on a world scale of co-operation? The disciples timidly exclaimed, 'Whence shall we have sufficient to satisfy the wants of thousands?' Christ points us the way.

2. **A new sense of responsibility** is, I believe, dawning upon the nations. We are our brother's keeper, although he may live in Czecho-Slovakia. This sense of corporate responsibility is brought home to us with vividness when we bear in mind that our own needs are supplied from all over the world. How much of our wheat comes from Canada, America, Australia, and other lands? If we had our eyes opened, we should be able to visualize the great rolling prairies, the thousands of miles of wheat, its cutting, threshing, and transport by the big box cars to the granaries and holds of the ships. We are dependent on others for our food.

But we shall realize our responsibilities most fully when we remember God's purpose for man and man's inalienable rights as a child of God. Further, if our social order were in keeping with that will of God and that lofty status of His children, then we should acknowledge the rights of others to the resources of the earth and give practical expression to them. No one would ever dream of questioning those rights, if he saw them in the right light. All would see to it that that share was made over in a natural and spontaneous spirit. Indeed there would be no starving peoples anywhere. The surplus harvest grain in one country would be immediately transported to any famine-stricken population and all should eat their bread in peace and plenty. 'Give ye them to eat,' is the plain command of our Lord in the year of grace 1945. But how shall this ideal state of affairs ever be brought about apart from the power of Christ's spirit?

3. Thirdly, we have in this question of the disciples and the reply of our Lord the Divine answer to the world's deeper needs and the Divine solution of our problems. These problems are both economic and spiritual: they have a relation to both body and soul. The best economists never ignore the ethical and spiritual aspects of any problem.

Christ was deeply conscious of man's two-fold needs. The accounts of the miracle reveal His deep concern for the hunger of men's bodies. He never lost sight of the fact that men have bodies which must be fed. Moreover, by word and action He showed the world that, where there is a genuine willingness to share with others, there appears also the miracle of a sufficient provision. Nay more, the scanty rations for a few become a royal feast for a multitude, if only the few are willing to share. That is the outward miracle of supply in which problems affecting food scarcity or meagreness of supply are triumphantly solved.

But then there is also the inward or spiritual side to every problem of this kind. Man has an immortal soul which only the infinite can satisfy. Indeed, that inward meaning leaps into the mind almost involuntarily when Christ bestows the supreme blessing of His grace and Presence which alone can satisfy the longing soul. In the great sixth chapter of John's Gospel the physical reference melts almost imperceptibly into the spiritual interpretations.

Now that multitude in the wilderness, tired, exhausted, and hungry, has its twentieth century counterpart in the clamant needs of the world in our post-war bewilderment and crisis. We need more than a buff ration-book and the goods which it allows: we need the daily ration of the Living Bread. Deep down is an insistent hunger for that Food which no earthly harvest can supply. Deep down is that insatiable craving for the Bread that never perisheth. This bread from heaven is as essential for the life of the soul as ordinary bread for the life of the body. Many think of religion as 'a desirable supplement to life's normal fare,' and forget that it is the daily bread of our life without which any real life apart from physical being cannot be had. 'I am the bread of life,' said Christ, 'he that cometh to me shall never hunger' . . . and the bread that I will give is my flesh which *I will give for the life of the world.*' So in the midst of a devastated and desolate Europe the Cross still stands, the Hope of the world. And Christ has asked us as His disciples to help Him in this great work. It is a signal honour He has bestowed upon us. He still says to us,

'Give *ye* them to eat.'

The Parable of the Good Samaritan (St. Luke x. 25–37).

A Suggested Re-orientation.

By the Reverend James C. Gordon, M.A., Manse of Cadder, Bishopbriggs.

In any attempt to unravel the meaning of the Parable of the Good Samaritan, one encounters a particular 'knot.' Most expositors treat this as did Alexander the famous Gordian knot: they slash it away. The knot in question lies in the turn which Jesus seems to give to the question put to Him by the lawyer, viz.: 'Who is my neighbour?' This question is quite straightforward. As the story proceeds we should imagine that Jesus would conclude by saying or suggesting—'The wounded man is your neighbour—any man in need is your neighbour,' thus providing a clear and unequivocal answer to the question. This, in fact, is how the expositors explain the Parable. This, they insist, is the point at which Jesus was aiming. But the difficulty is that Jesus did not suggest that the 'wounded man' was 'the neighbour' who supplied the answer to the question. Instead, Jesus asks, 'Who was neighbour—*to the wounded man*?' That is the knot, and it does not seem satisfactory to slash through it.

One hesitates to see a problem in something which such a recognized authority as Dr. E. F. Scott dismisses by saying: 'The Parable of the Good Samaritan was spoken in answer to the question: "Who is my neighbour?" Luke has perhaps missed the point of the answer, for at the close of the Parable he makes Jesus ask, "Who then was neighbour to him who fell among thieves?"' (*Ethical Teaching of Jesus*, 84). The way in which this knot is slashed in Gordian fashion is to assume that Jesus turned the whole point of the question to a new angle. To quote Dr. Scott again: 'It may be that Jesus Himself gave a different turn to the question put to Him, and declared that instead of considering who is our neighbour maybe we should study at all times and to all people to show ourselves neighbourly'

(*ib.*). In line with this is the judgment of Dr. A. J. Grieve: 'The parable answers the question: "Whose neighbour am I?" not, "Who is my neighbour?"' Dr. J. Alexander Findlay likewise says: 'The question is not "Who is my neighbour?" but, "To whom can I show myself neighbourly?"' (*Abingdon Commentary*, 1043*b*). Again, G. R. H. Shafto in his book on the Parables declares that Jesus enlarges the scope of the question (*The Stories of the Kingdom*, 180). Dr. Campbell Morgan puts it even more bluntly. He writes: 'The first thing which arrests me in reading the story is that Christ never answered the question the lawyer asked. In His reply He changed the whole emphasis of the man's question. . . . The whole point of Christ's answer is this: The question is not who your neighbour is, but are you a neighbour?' (*The Gospel According to Luke*, 139*b*).

The above weight of evidence is sufficiently impressive, but the real point to note is that every expositor has, like Morgan, been 'arrested' by the turn which Jesus seems to give to the lawyer's question. Obviously this 'turn' has some significance, but I assert that Jesus *seems* to give the question a turn, because I suggest that another interpretation of Jesus' answer is possible. I suggest that Jesus gives quite a logical and straightforward answer to the lawyer.

In attempting to clear the way for this interpretation let us note that the assumption behind the usual interpretation (as quoted above) is that Jesus intended the lawyer to put himself in the place of the *Samaritan*! The Samaritan is set up as a good example to the lawyer—'Go and do thou likewise.' In the last analysis this must be the final significance of the story, yet I am inclined to think that the initial assumption is false. It is that assumption which has shifted the centre of gravity of the Parable. Can you imagine Jesus suggesting a comparison between the lawyer and the Samaritan—an outcast, one whose very name the lawyer avoided taking on his lips when he answered Jesus' question? I believe that Jesus was really suggesting to the lawyer that he should place himself in the position of the *wounded traveller*! I am inclined to think that this story has suffered in a somewhat similar fashion to that of the Parable of the Prodigal Son. With regard to the latter we know that the chief character is really the Father and that the title of the story would better be that of 'The Loving Father.' Might not the same be true of this other parable? We call it the Parable of the Good Samaritan because he has 'stolen the picture,' to use the current phrase from the Cinema. But for Jesus' immediate purpose was he really the focus of the tale? Does the story not really centre in 'a certain man who journeyed from Jerusalem to Jericho'? Is it not there that the point of the story lies? Is it not in their relation and reaction to him that our judgment of the other characters rests? Might it not help to a correct exegesis if we called the parable that of 'The Wounded Traveller'?

With that introduction let us examine the situation which occasioned the story.

The lawyer, nonplussed by Jesus' answer to his first question, and seeking to save his face by entangling Jesus in an argument, proceeded to ask the further question: 'Who is my neighbour?' This was quite an academic question. It was one to which the Rabbis and lawyers had already given a clearly defined answer. 'Orthodoxy had already defined the term so as to exclude Samaritans and Gentiles, and so far as the lawyer was concerned the whole problem was prejudged' (Shafto, *ib.* 178). Jesus' story attacks the very foundations of that answer and establishes a new point of view altogether. Jesus, in fact, is saying to the lawyer—'You have settled this question academically; you have discussed all the theories and drawn your conclusions; let us put the whole matter to the test of experience; let us see how *life* answers your question.' 'So Jesus defined a neighbour in a story which age after age lays its constraint on the conscience of mankind. He lifted the question out of the atmosphere of controversy, since in that atmosphere real questions can never be settled, and set it down—where? He set it down on a dangerous road in Palestine!' (G. A. Buttrick, *The Parables of Jesus*, 150). He told the story of a certain man—whom we assume to be a Jew. This man stands for the lawyer himself, or for any of that listening crowd. How apt would this be! For most of the hearers had taken that self-same journey, not once but many times. They knew its notorious reputation. They could picture themselves going along that dangerous way, and lo! this dreaded tragedy happened. They were set upon by robbers, wounded and robbed and left bleeding by the wayside. They are in dire need of the services of a 'neighbour.' Along comes a Priest. By the code of their faith he *is* a 'neighbour.' There is an obligation laid on him to help. Moreover, apart from the academic question of legal obligation by virtue of his very office there is all the more constraint on him to stop and lend a helping hand. But he passes on! Anon comes a Levite—also, according to the legal code, a 'neighbour.' But he too passes by. Then comes a Samaritan. According to your code, implies Jesus, he is *not* a 'neighbour.' He is an outcast. There is no legal obligation for him to do anything. In a sense he would be justified in ignoring your con-

dition, for that is how you would treat *him*! But, instead, he stops. Here is something more than an affair of rights and duties. Here is a situation greater than national prejudices. There is an instinct of humanity which the Samaritan obeys. And because of that, he comes to the rescue. 'The stricken man was brother to the Samaritan because the stricken man also was human' (Buttrick, *ib.* 153). Now, implies Jesus, legally, *i.e.* according to your code, the Priest and Levite were 'neighbours' of the wounded man, but the Samaritan was *not* a 'neighbour.' But tell me which, in point of fact, was really the 'neighbour'? And the lawyer could do naught but deny the academic answer and reply, 'He that showed compassion on him.' Here we need to remember that our focal point is still the Wounded Traveller, not the Samaritan. The crux of the story does not lie, as the popular interpretation has it, in the thought that 'my neighbour is he who *needs my help*'; it lies in the thought that my neighbour is 'he who *helps my need*'! In other words, Jesus asks us to discover who our neighbour is, not by thinking of someone who needs us but by thinking of someone who comes to us in answer to *our* need. 'Jesus does not, in His concluding question, ask, "Of which of these three was the wounded man the neighbour?" He does not answer the lawyer's question by saying "That wounded man is your neighbour." No; He reverses the order: "Which was neighbour *to him*?" And the point is this: the priest or the Levite should have said, "If *I* lay there, and that wounded man were passing by, should I not wish *him* to regard *me* as his neighbour?"' (E. Stock, *Talks on St. Luke's Gospel*, 178).

Such, it appears to me, is how Jesus turns the question of the lawyer. 'Who is my neighbour?' he had asked, and Jesus makes him answer the question himself, not by the sophistries of academic discussion but by the sheer facts of life and experience. And is not Jesus right? I may declare, logically enough, in answer to the lawyer's question, that my neighbours will naturally be my own kith and kin, people who have certain specific obligations towards me. But it is a tragic and sad fact of experience that often those to whom I instinctively look for help prove 'unnatural' and unneighbourly. And it is also true to experience to say that the 'outsider,' the one on whom I have no claim, is often swift to come to my aid.

On this interpretation the Parable seems quite straightforward. Let us recapitulate. The lawyer asks Jesus the question: 'Who is my neighbour?' Jesus (so to speak) replies: You have already got your own answer according to your preconceived ideas. You have already drawn your fine distinctions and you have clearly defined who is (and who is not) your neighbour. But put your theories to the practical test. Imagine yourself like a certain man journeying from Jerusalem to Jericho who is set upon by thieves and robbed and injured. In your condition of need and peril who then is your neighbour? You will find that your ideas require revision in the light of your experience. You will find that those who ought to have been neighbourly will evade their responsibility; and you may be fortunate to find that someone on whom you have no claim whatever will count your need *his* responsibility. The real neighbour will be revealed by his neighbourliness. [Buttrick points out that 'the Greek reveals the emphasis which Jesus placed on His closing question: "Which of them *proved* neighbour?"' (*ib.* 155).] 'Who is my neighbour?' you ask. The answer which experience gives is that your neighbour is he who comes to your aid in your hour of need! And in that hour you will not be concerned to question his 'credentials'; he will prove his credentials by his spirit and his service. You will not refuse his help because he speaks in a different tongue; you will understand him because he will speak in the universal language—that of love. . . . And when the lawyer admitted the rightness of Jesus' logic, the Master said: 'Go, and do thou likewise.'

It thus appears that this Parable is a commentary on the Golden Rule: 'And as ye would that men should do to you, do ye also to them likewise' (Lk 6^{31}).

Contributions and Comments.

Did Jesus speak Aramaic?

I HAVE received the January EXPOSITORY TIMES and have read the article by Taylor 'Did Jesus speak Aramaic?' Taking myself the opposite viewpoint, I wish to criticize not so much his conclusions as the method adopted. The question cannot be settled by quotations from Acts, Josephus or even G. A. Smith. It is rather a philological matter. There is something of a case for the belief that our Greek Gospels bear marks of translation from an Aramaic original (whether oral or written, fragments or a whole cannot perhaps at this stage be fully determined), and though possibly this is only an appearance, and derives rather from the underlying Semitic thoughts of people speaking Greek as a second language, I think the case for actual misunderstandings and obscurities in translating a written original can itself be reasonably well proven (though not all the conclusions drawn therefrom by some scholars can be substantiated. It follows of course that if there is *any* case for translation from Aramaic to Greek, Jesus and His disciples must have spoken Aramaic, for the idea of a double translation (Gk.-Aram.-Gk.) is untenable. Further, I believe that if the vocabulary of the sayings of Jesus were carefully examined, it would be found to move almost completely within the range of contemporary Aramaic vocabulary, and comparison of the translators' equivalents in LXX (Hebrew-Greek) Targums (Hebrew-Aramaic) and Peshitto (Greek-Aramaic) only strengthens the belief that Jesus spoke Aramaic. There is of course much work to be done on these lines, but I am sure that this is the key to the problem.

Even the kind of evidence used by Taylor is not all on his side. There is the evidence of Targum and Talmud, as well as Mishna, that Jewish study continued along purely Semitic lines, and I cannot believe that in His disputations with scribes and Pharisees Jesus used Greek. Quite apart from their religious prejudices, what would become of the Talmudic type of argument, with its dependence on quotation from the Scriptures, and play on words, if translated into Greek? Moreover surely the scribes and Pharisees would have charged Jesus with Hellenism if He had spoken and taught in Greek?

W. G. M. ABBOTT.

Port Elizabeth, C.P., South Africa.

The Son of Man.

A Brief General Statement.

THE question of the meaning of the expression 'The Son of Man' as it is employed by Jesus, constitutes a most difficult problem which scholars have been investigating for many years. The literature on the subject is extremely extensive and one can easily get entangled in a maze of complicated linguistic argumentations. Hence a brief general statement of the central issues involved may be of value to many people.

The Old Testament was written in Hebrew and the language generally spoken among the Jews in Palestine in the time of Jesus was Aramaic, which belonged to the same family—the Semitic family—of languages. The Aramaic for Son of Man was *bar nasha*, and as in Hebrew could be used either in the singular or in the plural with the simple meaning of 'man' or 'humanity.' This usage occurs in the later books of the Old Testament, as, for instance, in Ps 8, where we have: 'What is the son of man that thou visitest him?' Obviously the meaning here is simply 'man.'

But *bar nasha* could also be used as a modest and indirect designation of oneself. We might compare the editorial 'we' and the expression 'the present writer' both of which mean 'I.' The evidence for this usage of *bar nasha* is indirect, but it is none the less a reasonable inference to make.

Further, *bar nasha* came to have a special symbolic meaning in the Jewish apocalyptic writings, that is, in the writings which claimed to describe the glorious Kingdom of the future which God would one day introduce and for which the Jews longed with eager expectation. In this technical sense it did not mean 'man' or 'humanity' but the being or beings who would inaugurate or enjoy the new order of God's glorious reign. The most important passages for this technical or special use of *bar nasha* are Dn 7 and the Similitudes of Enoch 37–71.

When we turn to the New Testament we make use of the first three Gospels only, because the Fourth Gospel was written too late and contains too much personal interpretation on the part of the author or authors to be of much value in such an investigation as this. In these three Gospels we find that all three of the above meanings of *bar nasha* occur. On various grounds (which cannot be given here) ten occurrences of *bar nasha* can be regarded as historically incorrect or erroneously attributed to Jesus; these are in Mt 10^{23}; 12^{40}; 13^{37}; 13^{41}; 16^{13}; 16^{28}; 18^{11}; 26^{2}; Lk 6^{22}; 9^{56}. In the passages which remain *bar nasha* probably means 'I' twice (Lk 7^{34} and 11^{30}), and 'man' or 'humanity' three times (Mk 2^{10}; 2^{28}; Lk 12^{10}) and bears the technical meaning in the residuum consisting of some twenty-seven sayings (Mk 8^{31}; 8^{38}; 9^{9}; 9^{12}; 9^{31}; 10^{33}; 10^{45}; 13^{26}; 14^{21} (twice); 14^{41}; 14^{62}; Lk 9^{58}; 12^{8}; 12^{40}; 17^{22}; 17^{24}; 17^{26}; 17^{30}; 18^{8}; 19^{10}; 21^{36}; 22^{48}; 22^{69}; Mt 19^{28}; 24^{30} (?); 25^{31}). Twenty-two of these sayings are spoken privately to the disciples, all twenty-seven are uttered after Peter's confession

at Cæsarea-Philippi, and they all refer to Jesus' redemptive mission for men, His sufferings, humiliation, homelessness, betrayal, death, resurrection and His future coming in glory to establish the perfect Kingdom of God. It is pretty clear, therefore, that Jesus attaches a special eschatological significance to *bar nasha* in these passages.

What is that significance? And why did Jesus make use of this mysterious expression? To take the second question first, it is probable that Jesus preferred *bar nasha* to 'Messiah' because, although He believed that He was the chosen representative of God who would inaugurate God's glorious reign through His mission and message, He did not believe that the popular notions associated with the word 'Messiah' in His day were sound. According to these notions the Kingdom of God would come by military conquest against the Roman Empire under the leadership of the Messiah, whereas Jesus believed that the Kingdom would come in glory only by the acceptance of the rôle of the Suffering Servant of the Lord (Is 53) who gives his life without stint or reserve in loving service to mankind. Doubtless this explains why Jesus did not openly acknowledge that He was Messiah until He was before the tribunal and about to end His career on earth. *Bar nasha*, however, was not a word in common use for the Messiah and had therefore not the same evil associations. How difficult it was for the Jews of that time to think of the Messiah as one who serves and suffers for men is seen in the attitude of Peter at Cæsarea-Philippi (Mk 8^{31-33}).

Further definition of what Jesus meant by *bar nasha* depends very largely on whether we hold that Jesus was thinking in terms of the usage in Daniel or of that in Enoch. In the latter work *bar nasha* is a heavenly individual elected by God to judge the world and inaugurate the Kingdom in glory, while in Daniel *bar nasha* stands for the community of faithful Jews who will inherit the promises and one day share in the blessings of God's Kingdom. If, then, we interpret the twenty-seven passages in the light of Daniel's usage, the 'Son of Man' must refer not to Jesus Himself alone, but to the community which consists of Jesus plus His faithful followers. The most notable exponent of this view is Dr. T. W. Manson of Manchester (see his *Teaching of Jesus*, Cambridge, 1935). Perhaps the ablest exponent of the contrary interpretation in the light of Enoch is Professor J. Héring of Strasbourg (see his *Le royaume de Dieu et sa venue*, Paris, 1937).

T. A. BURKILL.

Manchester College, Oxford.

The Sequence of the Two Epistles to the Thessalonians.

THE probability of the priority of the Second Epistle to the First Epistle, in time of writing, expressed by your Contributor, the Rev. L. O. Bristol, omits to take account of the following points of evidence:

1. The early testimony as to the two Epistles. The Fragment of Muratori, A.D. 170, has,

> '. . . ad colosensis quarta ad calatas quin ta ad tensaolenecinsis sexta ad romanos septima verum corintheis et thesaolecen sibus licet pro correbtione iteretur . . .'

('for the sake of admonition there is a second to the Corinthians and to the Thessalonians.' GWATKIN).

Nor has any ancient claim been put forward that the traditional order should be reversed. Indeed to do this is to run completely counter to the Tübingen school (Hilgenfeld, Pfleiderer, Schmiedel, Weizsäcker) which would put the second letter as late as subsequent to the Apostle's death.

2. The estimated period of the sojourns at Berea and Athens.

To all appearances not very long. The opposition of the Synagogue at Thessalonica had not abated, although the 'disturber of the peace' had departed. The inference is that, along with the 'searching of the scriptures' to ascertain the basis of St. Paul's assertions respecting the identity of the Messiah, an inquiry had gone forward to the Synagogue Elders at Thessalonica, the outcome of which hastened his departure. There was no Synagogue at Berea. The stay at Athens was likely to have been even shorter than at Berea. There is no subsequent reference to Christian communities at either of these places, and neither stay would be conducive to the quiet and reflection essential for either letter, or for reports and inquiries to be brought in and considered, and laid before God for inspired reply.

3. The classes in these Greek towns would in the main consist of three:

(*a*) Conservative Jews, with Judean traditions. 'Ἰουδαῖοι.'

(*b*) Liberal minded Jews, born abroad. 'Ἑλληνιστάι.'

(*c*) Greeks. 'Ἕλληνες,' local inhabitants. Not uninterested in or uninfluenced by the prevailing Mystery Cults, especially Mithraism, and nurtured in Greek psychology.

The latter classes were termed 'σεβόμενοι,' *i.e.* adherents desirous of Monotheism, but unwilling (as yet) to submit to the rite of circumcision, and they formed the bulk of the Thessalonican Church.

4. The persons addressed in the two Epistles, and the main point of the application.

Epistle I has its 'direction' towards the third class mentioned above. They are converts from Paganism (1 Th 1^{9}). And the Apostle retains a vivid recollection of his recent sufferings both among them and at Philippi, not omitting their own sufferings when the tide of persecution turned against them also (1 Th 2^{14}). These are not referred to so definitely, if at all, in the second letter.

Epistle II has a 'direction' towards the Jewish adherents, probably a minority in the Christian community, versed in the Hebrew lore of the expectancy of a Messiah.[1] The point of the application of the Apocalyptic section, reiterating what he had imparted to them previously, centres upon the soul-destroying peril of 'apostasy.' Unbelief is the sin of those who have been drawn to the line of decision and turned back. Apostasy is the sin of those who have come over the line, entered into full covenant allegiance, and have subsequently turned away in recantation, or are in grave danger of such.

The Apostle's reply therefore, in either Epistle, is to two different inquiries emanating from two classes among the adherents; and this is at variance with your correspondent's statement, that 2 Thessalonians 'deals with the same problems' as the First Epistle. The problem of Epistle I is 'Why is the "*παρουσία*" delayed? The problem of Epistle II is the deadly conflict attended by "*ἀποστασία*."'

While there is no evidence, beyond mere possibility, that the Apocalypse of Epistle II should precede that of Epistle I, there is evident connexion between 2 Th 2^2 (beware of those who say the '*παρουσία*' is impending), and 1 Th 4^{16}, 'the Lord will descend.' To transpose the order calls for a much stronger reason than that which is revealed by the psychological sequence of these two references and their contexts. The likelihood is greater that the Apocalypse of 2 Thessalonians grew out of 1 Thessalonians rather than the reverse.

[1] Harnack, *Das Problem der zweiten Thessalonicher Briefs.*

The main reasons for the theory are examined and ably summarized by Dr. Wade,[2] namely:

1. The allusion to his autograph in 2 Th 3^{17}, which, it is alleged, would only occur in a *first* letter. Yet it occurs in 1 Co 16^{21}, where a previous letter has evidently been written, and is referred to in 5^9.

2. The command to 'do your own business and work with your hands, even as we charged you,' in 1 Th 4^{11}, is alleged to be a repetition of a similar command in 2 Th 3^{10}; but it may equally have been the repetition of a verbal command, uttered while he was with them, or sent through Timothy.

3. The Jewish element in the Second Epistle, it is urged, would have been dealt with first, since the Jewish element in the Church was stronger at first than later. To which the reply is that the preponderance of the Gentile element would call from him the prior consideration.

When these three reasons have been weighed and set on one side as hardly convincing to overthrow the weight of antiquity, there remains but slight ground for the probabilities of the transposition of the two writings, and the suggestion thus becomes more confusing than illuminating.

Your correspondent in his closing sentence does not answer his own veiled question, that if in the quiet of the prolonged visit to Corinth St. Paul was able to indite Epistle I, why not, in the light of 2 Th 2^2, Epistle II also?

EDWARD THOMPSON.

The Vicarage, Paddock Wood, Kent.

[2] *N.T. History*, p. 264.

Entre Nous.

A Black Heart.

For five years, from 1926 to 1931, Dom Bernard Clements, O.S.B., worked and taught in Africa as Rector of St. Augustine's Theological College, Kumasi. The story of these five years has been told by one of his students, Mr. G. E. F. Laing, now an African Priest of the Diocese of Accra.

The highest tribute, he says, that the African can pay to the white who is looked upon as a genuine friend is to say of him, 'he looks white on the skin but his heart is that of a black man.' Bernard had a 'black heart.' It was his love for Africa that was the key to their hearts. And after he returned to England they knew that he still longed to be back with them. In one letter which Mr. Laing treasures Dom Bernard Clements writes: 'On Sunday, August 2, at 6.30 p.m. (5.30 p.m. Gold Coast Time), I am to preach in Westminster Abbey. And on Sunday, August 23, at 10.30 a.m. (9.30 a.m. Gold Coast Time), in St. Paul's Cathedral. I will remember that God wants me there and has work for me to do in these places, but I *wish* He wanted me in Africa.'

His students were specially struck by the humility of their Rector. 'We were asked by the Fr. Rector to write a sermon to suit Holy Week. A student wrote on the humility of our Lord. In the course of the sermon he wrote that "it would be better for the Kingdom of God if all His ministers were prepared to wash the feet of those to whom He sent them." After a day or two Father Bernard called the student into his room, showed that portion of his sermon to him, and said,

" You wrote these words, and I thank you for writing them. Would you allow me then to wash your feet ? " With great reluctance the student agreed. Bernard then fetched water and soap and his own white towel, and stooped down and washed the feet of the student—and kissed them.'

Dom Bernard Clements in Africa has been published by the S.C.M. at 2s. 6d. net.

Compassion.

' The word compassion holds, I believe, a pregnant secret. I remember an acutely musical friend who went with me to listen to a school festival of singing in the cathedral at Kampala. Some Bach the choir did very well, and the school children sang carols (a quality of dispassionate comment their carol-singing has which moves me very much), and the girls' school from Busoga did a lovely setting of Psalm xxiii. to a local melody —then there was some good round singing of hymns they all knew, chorales mostly—and I was well content, but no, not he—" No," he said as we came away, " they sing without compassion, I can't stomach it." I was startled, but I said as we talked about it, " Isn't compassion, as a matter of fact, a very high reach of the spirit, isn't it indeed the Christian contribution ? I believe that if they knew the full reaches of compassion our missionary job would be done." And I still believe that is true.

' There's one more comment though to add to that. God knew compassion (suffering-with) must be acted, done, not merely felt—and compassion was acted out in the Incarnation. And the amazing thing is that that drama acted on the human stage is pregnant still. Its plainness makes nonsense of a phrase like Burke's, that the business of the masses " is to venerate where they are unable presently to comprehend." Sometimes there have to be lesser incarnations, " go and do thou likewise," before men will give their full attention to the supreme and central act (that's why a mission hospital can be so potent as a pioneer). But when it is fully heeded, then the catharsis, the purgation is worked, and something new is born, a new creature marked by tenderness and compassion— " clear shining after rain " is what conveys it to me. Then comes " the response in the lively soul," which we call worship.' [1]

God in the Jungle.

' One thing occurred to many of us in the jungle. We used to ask ourselves how we could ever have taken the comforts of civilization and the wonder of living so much for granted. . . . When the campaign was over and the first batch of the sick and wounded were on the way to hospital a reporter asked some one what he thought of the jungle. An officer replied : " Out there we all of us came very close to God." ' [2]

[1] Mary Stuart, *African Pattern.*
[2] *Wingate's Raiders.*

Eric Liddell.

The Secretary of the China Inland Mission, Dr. Arthur Taylor, reported lately that the Rev. Eric Liddell, who was a member of the staff of the Anglo-Chinese College at Tientsin, was interned by the Japanese at Weihsien, to which place practically all the scholars of the Chefoo schools were sent, and these girls and boys found in him their hero. He organized the games and sports, participated in them and inspired the pupils of the schools with his own intense enthusiasm for the larger and greater issues life involves. Members of the staff, he said, ' owe more than they can ever tell to Mr. Eric Liddell's presence at Weihsien.' And, he added, ' one cannot but think that this brilliantly outstanding athlete was sent to Weihsien " for such a time as this." '

From Hole to Hole.

Our friend Ezra in *The Methodist Recorder* of 31st May tells this story : ' In Mexico, in the State of Jalisco, there is a town called Lagos, whose citizens are, like those reputed to dwell here, at Gotham. Once, says a letter now spread before me, which comes from that very State, there was a pit in the main square of the town, and the citizens were worried as to how to get rid of it. Then they had the brilliant idea of digging a pit a short distance from the original one, filling up the first pit with the earth from the second, and going on in the same way until they had got the pit out of the town. That is the Lagos way of doing things, and not peculiar to them, for elsewhere history seems to be just a story of movement from one hole to another. Perhaps we import our leaders from Lagos.'

The Papuan Version of the Apostles' Creed.

I believe in God, our Father, Who has made all things in Heaven and on Earth, and Who loves all men.

I believe in Jesus Christ, God's beloved Son, our Lord.

He taught us the Way of the Father.

He died on the Cross.

He was laid in the Grave.

His Spirit conquered death and now lives with the Father and with men.

I believe His Holy Spirit is near to help us.

I believe that those who love Jesus Christ are one people.

I believe that after death we live with God our Father, life everlasting. Amen.[3]

[3] Cecil Northcott, *Glorious Company*, 110.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.